Learning Without Limits

An Agenda for the Office of Postsecondary Education

U.S. Department of Education

November 2000

Based on a national dialogue with the postsecondary education community

To All Citizens Interested in Postsecondary Education:

For many years I have described our postsecondary education system as the jewel of our education system—and the envy of the world. At the U.S. Department of Education and its Office of Postsecondary Education (OPE), we are continually working to help improve and expand that great system to provide access to all Americans.

The economic benefits of a college education to the individual are well documented. The benefits of an educated citizenry to our democratic society are even more important. Participants at an international meeting on education recently stated that higher education has a role "as a beacon for society" to help move civilization forward. With this *Agenda Report: Learning Without Limits,* we are working to move postsecondary education forward.

Already, this report has been useful for the Department in developing new ways of better serving our stakeholders. We hope it will be helpful to all in the postsecondary education community in creating an agenda for the years ahead, particularly in the debates leading to the next reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. We hope it starts a discussion and sparks change as to how we can best meet the needs of students, institutions, the business and nonprofit communities, and the entire nation in the changing environment of the 21st century. We look forward to hearing your reactions to this report.

This report represents months of effort and much hard work by the department's Office of Postsecondary Education, and by all those in the postsecondary education community who participated in the *Agenda Project* process. My thanks to all involved.

Sincerely,

Richard W. Riley

U.S. Secretary of Education

To All Citizens Interested in Postsecondary Education:

In the 20th anniversary year of the U.S. Department of Education, the Office of Postsecondary Education (OPE) created the *Agenda Project* to look to the future and develop a blueprint for the federal role in postsecondary education.

From January to June 2000, OPE met with over 75 groups representing our various constituencies, held four public meetings in different regions across the country, and established an *Agenda Project* Web site to solicit written comments. We asked for ideas and advice from college and university presidents, administrators, trustees, and faculty, trade and proprietary school executives, students, parents, community members, Congressional staff, financial aid officers, business and technology leaders, teachers, and others interested in education.

We asked three basic questions: 1) What are the most significant opportunities and challenges facing American postsecondary education in the next five years? 2) What are the appropriate roles for the U.S. Department of Education in postsecondary education? 3) How can the U.S. Department of Education best maintain a continuing dialogue with all those who have a stake in postsecondary education?

In every discussion, these questions generated a remarkable range of thoughtful comments from the participants. They were eager to talk about the significant changes of the past 20 years. They were frank about the challenges facing the postsecondary education community, concerned about the future, yet optimistic about the opportunities. We heard much about an enhanced federal role, particularly in promoting access, expanding financial support, disseminating best practices, and using the "bully pulpit" in support of higher education. Our heartfelt thanks to all who participated.

The many issues and opportunities participants identified are discussed under five general themes: Ensuring All Students Are Prepared to Go to College and Succeed; Examining the Roles and Responsibilities in Paying for College; Improving Teacher Quality; Integrating Technology and Distance Education into the Curriculum; and Revitalizing International Education. These themes reflect the thinking of stakeholders as to what a national agenda for postsecondary education should be. Responding to what we heard, we have identified twelve strategies to improve how OPE serves its stakeholders, and more than thirty steps OPE should take. We believe we had a successful national dialogue on these questions. The goal of this report is to make sure the dialogue continues and changes are made.

Without the hard work, long hours, and insightful input of the dedicated staff at OPE, this report never would have happened. For their efforts, they all have my thanks and gratitude.

Sincerely,

A. Lee Fritschler

Contents

Introduction: A Turning Point for Postsecondary Education

We must respond to the rapidly evolving needs of numerous and diverse stakeholders, question existing premises and arrangements, and eliminate unnecessary processes and administrative structures.

> James J. Duderstadt, president emeritus, University of Michigan, in his recent book, *A University for the 21st Century*

At the start of the 21st century scientists mapped the human genome; the economy set a record for sustained growth; unemployment dropped to its lowest level in 30 years; electronic commerce hit the $5.3 billion mark; the World Wide Web grew to 2.1 billion pages and counting. The population of the U.S., more than 275 million, continued to grow as it simultaneously became more diverse. The various advances have created opportunities and benefits for the vast majority of Americans.

Education is the keystone to continuing the success for both individuals and society at large. Increasingly, in the information age, postsecondary education is a necessity. Yet, the value of a postsecondary education goes beyond mere economics. As the problems and questions society faces become more complicated and complex, postsecondary education prepares citizens to be thoughtful participants in the decisions and debates; postsecondary education passes on the best of our heritage and helps every new American discover what it means to be a citizen in this country. It has always done this. If it is to continue to do so, it must adapt to the rapid pace of change facing all segments of society.

Competition is a hallmark of this changing landscape. Arthur Levine, President of the Teachers' College at Columbia University, made this clear in a recent speech. As he pointed out, "**For the first time in U.S. history, the profit-making sector sees education as an investment opportunity.** Increasingly viewed as poorly run, low in productivity, very high in cost, and yet [unable] to effectively make use of technology, the 250 billion dollar annual higher education industry is being seen by the now cash-rich, for-profit sector as the next health care industry—another business ripe for takeover, remaking, and of course, producing big fat profits."

In addition to competition, America's universities, two- and four-year colleges, community colleges, trade schools, and other postsecondary institutions face numerous other challenges in adjusting to the changing environment. Increased enrollment, assessment and outcome questions, financial and access issues, technological advances,

and international developments are all changing the education landscape—rapidly. It is not an exaggeration to say that we are at a turning point; it is almost a cliché.

The postsecondary education community knows the urgency of the situation. The nation's governors know; over the next few years, the National Governors' Association intends to closely study the postsecondary education system to determine how best to prepare citizens for our knowledge-based economy. The Congress knows this. The U.S. Department of Education and its Office of Postsecondary Education know this too. They all know that if the education community doesn't respond to the challenges, the for-profit sector will. We need to figure out how to best use the strengths of both sectors, separately and in conjunction with each other.

The Federal Effort and the Office of Postsecondary Education's Role

In examining the federal role over the past 50 years, it is clear that the federal government has provided leadership, resources, and support to states, institutions, and students in order to help address challenges that are national rather than local in scope. Some of OPE's oldest programs, for example, were established in 1958 under the National Defense Education Act to provide foreign language and cultural expertise that were critical to national security in the Cold War era.

In the 1960s and 1970s, as the nation came to terms with the fact that broader access to higher education was becoming increasingly critical to individual opportunity and national economic prosperity, Congress authorized new programs to help get first-generation college students to and through postsecondary education (the TRIO programs); to help families finance postsecondary study (the Pell Grant, Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant, College Work-Study, and Title IV loan programs); and to strengthen institutional capacity to serve larger numbers of underserved students (the Strengthening Institutions programs).

Recent Reform Efforts

Over the past eight years, President Clinton, Vice President Gore, the U.S. Department of Education, and the Congress have worked hard to provide access to postsecondary education to all Americans. For example, they more than doubled the investment in student aid through more grants, more affordable student loans, and new paths to college. The new Hope Scholarship tax credit provides up to $1,500 in tax relief for each of the first two years of college. The Lifetime Learning Credit (LLC) provides up to $1,000 (increasing to $2,000 in 2003) for juniors, seniors, and graduate students, as well as those taking classes part-time to upgrade job skills. The LLC, which is also available for the first and second years of college if a student doesn't use the Hope Scholarship, can be used any number of times during an individual's lifetime. The new Direct Student Loan program has resulted in all students' obtaining loans more quickly, simply, and cheaply.

Realizing that college sights and strong academic preparation have to be set early, the new GEAR UP initiative raises expectations. GEAR UP is estimated to help more than

700,000 disadvantaged middle-school students in 2001[1] get—and stay—on track for college success through partnerships between high-poverty middle schools, colleges, universities, and communities. The federal support for TRIO programs to help low-income students succeed in college has increased by two-thirds since 1993 to $645 million.[2]

Federally supported government financial aid to students, including Pell Grants, student loans, the new Hope Scholarship and Lifetime Learning Credits, has increased from about $30 billion in 1993[3] to a projected $60 billion in 2001.[4] Since 1993, the maximum Pell Grant for America's neediest students has gone from $2,300 to $3,300[5]—a 43.5 percent increase. Since 1990, the U.S. Department of Education's direct aid to postsecondary institutions has grown from $841 million to over $1.7 billion.[6]

In 1998, Congress authorized a range of new programs to address new challenges facing postsecondary education. These programs build partnerships to increase the number of low-income students who successfully go on to college; to improve teacher quality and teacher preparation; and to use technology to enhance quality distance education. In a landmark change, Congress created a separate Performance Based Organization office to administer the Department of Education's mammoth financial aid programs—freeing up the Office of Postsecondary Education to focus more on broader issues and ways to meet students' needs.

All these changes have been necessary for multiple reasons, but the primary reason is the numbers are multiplying.

The Students Are Coming! The Students Are Coming!

You don't need to be Paul Revere to realize that more Americans are going to college than ever before. Sixty-six percent of 1998 high school graduates enrolled in college the following fall.[7] In the fall of 2000, approximately 15.1 million students enrolled at postsecondary institutions. More than 40 percent of these students are enrolled part-time, and a similar proportion are older than 24 years of age. This fall enrollment figure, which is substantially less than year-round enrollment, is projected to reach 17.5 million by 2010. Additionally, more Americans are taking adult courses and certificate programs—in 1998, 50 percent of adults participated in formal learning.[8]

Yet, more remains to be done.

Unfortunately, about one-third of students who enter college or trade school drop out before they earn a certificate or degree.[9] This number is unacceptable. The problem is acute among minorities: 29 to 31 percent of African Americans and Hispanics drop out of college in their first year, compared to 18 percent of whites.[10] These numbers, too, are unacceptable. All Americans deserve access to postsecondary education, and the message must be clear that the expectation is that everyone will finish. Today, there is no excuse for leaving anyone out.

So, in the 20th anniversary year of the U.S. Department of Education, in the wake of the 1998 Higher Education Act (HEA) reauthorization and the creation of a separate performance-based organization for administering student financial assistance programs and new initiatives moving OPE in different directions, with a new HEA reauthorization due in three years, with all the technological, scientific, demographic, political, and cultural changes taking place in our country and around the globe, OPE thought it appropriate to start a national discussion on key issues facing the postsecondary education community. This is one of the very few times a federal agency has launched such a systematic discussion.

The Changing Postsecondary Education Universe

A few decades ago, a high school diploma was regarded as adequate for most Americans and postsecondary education was reserved for a social and economic elite. Those days are over. In today's economy, lifetime learning is necessary, a constant retooling of skills and knowledge. **As Federal Reserve Board Chairman Alan Greenspan said in a speech before the American Council on Education, "The heyday when a high school or college education would serve a graduate for a lifetime is gone."**

Today, we are moving toward a universal system…and the public is embracing the trend. A recent survey succinctly stated this change: "Today, you don't even question whether you are going to college." From solely an economic standpoint, it is easy to see why. On average, a college graduate earns $600,000 more over a lifetime than a high school graduate.[11]

In 1972, 49 percent of high school graduates enrolled in a postsecondary institution within one year after graduating.[12] Today, more than 66 percent of students enter college the fall after they graduate.[13] In 1960, about 4 million students were enrolled in postsecondary institutions; today, approximately 15 million Americans are enrolled.[14] This growth will continue, and perhaps even accelerate, over the next 10 years. The need for postsecondary education is becoming universally recognized as a part of the American psyche. The school age population is growing. For example, California expects to see its postsecondary enrollment grow by 714,000 students—35 percent—over the next decade.[15] What do the numbers mean? How does the system respond to such growth—beyond just adding bricks and mortar?

California will respond, in part, by paying the tuition of low-income students with good grades. The measure, signed into law by Governor Gray Davis in September 2000, could cost the state more than $1 billion annually.

Other related forces also are having a powerful impact on postsecondary education today. Electronic distance education, new classroom applications, and other information technologies are transforming postsecondary institutions. The number of distance courses offered by U.S. postsecondary institutions and the number of enrollments nearly doubled between 1994-95 and 1997-98.[16] How will federal education policy respond to the

challenges of ensuring quality, delivering financial aid, and building technological capacity in this changed environment?

The new technology is raising an age-old question: What is the best way to measure outcomes? Now it is done by the seat of the pants, literally, not figuratively. Some Education Department rules are based on attendance—seat time—not mastery of a subject. The "digerati" charge that the academics don't get it, that the old rule is measuring the wrong end of the student. Yet if postsecondary institutions measure outcomes only, do they just become sophisticated testing services? What's the value of the campus experience, and should it be measured? The case for social and civic education gained from personal interaction with faculty and friends is strong. But how strong in the digital age? Is it valuable even if it can't be accurately measured? As distance learning grows, these measurement questions will have to be addressed.

Globalization is also imposing new demands on postsecondary institutions. More than ever before, America's students must be prepared to work in an international environment. Yet only a small number of U.S. students study abroad,[17] and we do not have in place adequate international studies curricula for students who cannot go overseas. Language study continues to languish. At the same time, we are facing increased competition from other countries in our efforts to attract foreign students to study at our postsecondary institutions.

Because of all these changes, the future will be very different.

The Future Is Now

Traditional delivery systems based on semesters and school years will be augmented by many alternative delivery modes. Students will be in and out of higher education institutions throughout their lifetimes. Whatever we thought of as "traditional" students will be a smaller part of the total. Certification or degree granting could well take on new meaning. Industry and other non-traditional institutions could do much of the certification conducted by postsecondary institutions today. The financial investment in postsecondary education will grow dramatically, raising serious questions about control, accountability, assessment, and regulation. In short, learning is becoming less restricted by barriers of time and place; stage of life; and other historic obstacles to postsecondary education. To cite one example, many public and private institutions are offering MBA degrees—online.

Postsecondary education is well on its way to becoming one of the largest enterprises in the United States. We want to make sure it becomes an even more efficient, effective, and equitable enterprise. The first step in changing is to ask the tough questions, including the very basic one: How can the federal government help institutions, students, educators, and all those with a stake in postsecondary education meet the challenges of *Learning Without Limits*? OPE's leaders conceived the *Agenda Project* as a way of finding answers to this and other questions.

What became clear through the process is that many factors point to a bigger role for OPE—not in terms of money or control, but primarily in terms of leadership and advocacy. *Agenda Project* participants described a changing, growing postsecondary education system, one difficult to fathom, let alone navigate. At a minimum, **OPE can serve its stakeholders as a doorway to new ideas, partnerships, and practices.**

What also became clear is that K-16 should really be considered K-Lifetime, and for the student the path should be seamless. The challenges should come in the classroom, not the finance office. The issues are intertwined and vertically integrated. We can't live in isolation or ivory towers anymore. Kindergarten and college are closer than we thought.

As U.S. Secretary of Education Richard W. Riley said in his seventh annual state of American education address**,** "…I continue to encourage America's higher education community to enter into a sustained dialogue with education reformers at the middle and secondary school levels. **The old paradigm of two distinct systems of education going their own way does not fit our modern times."**

This fall, a record 53 million students are enrolled in grades K-12.[18] They all must get the message early and often that they can go as far as they want to go with their education. Dennis Smith, the president of the University of Nebraska, recently sent a very clear message. He sent a letter to the parents of every eighth-grader in Nebraska outlining what courses their children need to take to get ready for college. All students should also get philosopher **John Dewey's message**, **"Education is not preparation for life, education is life itself."**

The *Agenda Project* Process

In 1999, OPE leaders developed a new mission statement for the office: "To mobilize national resources to promote opportunity and success for all Americans, in a global environment, through quality postsecondary education."

To further this mission, OPE is committed to:

- Developing and Strengthening Student Financial Aid Policies and Programs
- Helping All Americans Reach Postsecondary Education
- Improving Teaching at All Levels
- Supporting Undergraduate Postsecondary Students
- Supporting Graduate Postsecondary Students
- Promoting Innovation and Technology in Education

- Strengthening International Education

- Promoting Access Through Institutional Development and Support

For more information about OPE and its programs, please visit the OPE Web site at **www.ed.gov/offices/OPE/** or see Appendix B to this report.

In the course of refining its mission, OPE resolved to become a better gateway to the federal government for America's postsecondary education community. As part of this effort, OPE has published on the Web a Directory of Federal Programs for Postsecondary Education. The Directory is a comprehensive, single source of information on all federal programs on or relating to postsecondary education offered by all federal departments and agencies. The Directory includes more than 400 federal programs managed by more than a dozen departments and agencies, including the Department of Education.

Armed with its new mission, during the fall of 1999, the Office of Postsecondary Education began to reexamine the appropriate roles for the U.S. Department of Education and OPE in postsecondary education today and tomorrow.

First, we acknowledged that postsecondary education historically has been and must continue to be primarily the responsibility of states and the independent sector. We conceived the *Agenda Project* as a process for developing an agenda for the *federal role* in postsecondary education that respects the traditional responsibilities and authority of state and local government and of the independent and private sectors.

Then we began a process of actively seeking advice from a broad range of people and organizations with a stake in postsecondary education—college and university presidents and faculty, trade and proprietary school executives, students, parents, community members, business and technology leaders, and others interested in education.

From January to June 2000, OPE's leaders conducted "dialogue sessions" with over 75 groups representing these various constituencies, held four public meetings in different regions across the country, and established an *Agenda Project* Web site to solicit written comments. We asked three broad questions:

1) What are the most significant opportunities and challenges facing American postsecondary education in the next five years?

2) What are the appropriate roles for the U.S. Department of Education in postsecondary education?

3) How can the U.S. Department of Education best maintain a continuing dialogue with all those who have a stake in postsecondary education?

In every discussion, these questions generated a remarkable range of insightful thoughts and comments from the dialogue session participants. The ideas gathered through this process from people, organizations and communities across our nation are contained in this report.

We were impressed with the interest in the *Agenda Project* and the large number of eager participants in it. We heard much about an expanded federal role, particularly in promoting access, financial support, and dissemination of best practices, and in using the "bully pulpit" in support of higher education. We heard nothing about changing the historical, fundamental roles and shared responsibilities of governments, individuals, and the private sector in education.

Through this report, OPE continues to support a focused federal role in postsecondary education. We reaffirm our faith in the ability of postsecondary institutions and the organizations that represent them; businesses; markets; communities; and others in the independent, private, and state and local government sectors to identify and address the challenges they face. At the same time, we believe that the federal government can and should support students and institutions as they strive to meet these challenges and help build partnerships among the many groups that play a role in postsecondary education.

Above all, this report is designed to continue the dialogue and promote change that builds on the past eight years of innovation and growing opportunity in postsecondary education. Based on what we have learned so far, we have offered twelve strategies to seize the opportunities before us, and more than thirty OPE actions. To seize the opportunities, **we must all squarely face the tough questions of access, financing, accountability, regulatory reform, technology, teacher quality, and globalization.** It is clear our universe is changing rapidly. It is equally clear we have the resources to adapt to the change. Working together, we can make a quality postsecondary education a reality for all Americans.

To make sure this dialogue continues, we will schedule several public hearings next year to hear reactions to this report.

Theme 1

ACCESS: ENSURING ALL STUDENTS ARE PREPARED TO GO TO COLLEGE AND SUCCEED

The Information Age is truly the Education Age. That's why President Clinton and I have worked so hard to expand access to college for our young people and for adults who want to go back to school.

Vice President Gore, February 1998

Ever since the colonists established the first formal schools in the 1630s, one basic question has remained: who gets to go? Boys only? Whites only? Rich only? Fit only? Over the decades, the federal government has stepped in many times in the struggle to ensure that every American has access to an excellent education. A turning point for higher education came in 1862, when Congressman Justin Morrill of Vermont sponsored the First Morrill Act[19] to give each state land to support a college. Today, when postsecondary education is a universal expectation, there is no excuse for holding anyone back.

Educational attainment is one of the strongest predictors of financial and professional success, as well as civic involvement. For institutions, increased access makes possible a diversity of cultural, social, and economic backgrounds among the student body. This enhances the academic experience for everyone. Ensuring access to postsecondary education for all Americans continues to be one of the most important issues facing American society today. That is why it is a key mission of the U.S. Department of Education.

The Department and its Office of Postsecondary Education (OPE) employ three strategies to promote access to postsecondary education:

1. supporting an extensive and flexible student financial aid program (discussed in the next section of this report);
2. providing all students with the support they need to reach and succeed in higher education; and
3. ensuring that our country has strong, high-quality postsecondary schools to accommodate them.

Low-income and Minority Students

Students who do not attend college or who drop out quickly are predominantly persons from low-income families, living in underdeveloped areas within major cities or in sparsely populated rural areas, and who have attended ineffective elementary and secondary schools. Those who make it to college generally attend institutions that are undercapitalized, and they graduate at a rate that is significantly lower than their more advantaged counterparts.[20]

Inadequate academic preparation is the key factor in lack of college success. Members of low-income families are much less prepared for college than their higher income counterparts. For example, among high school graduates in 1992, only 21 percent of those with family incomes of less than $25,000 were highly qualified for admission at a four-year institution, and 20 percent were minimally qualified. For students with family incomes above $75,000, 56 percent were highly qualified and 12 percent minimally qualified.[21]

Students who are not prepared are also much less likely to succeed in college. For example, only 34 percent of students needing remedial reading completed a degree compared with 56 percent for students who did not take any remedial courses.[22]

It is quite clear that improving access and success in college requires a continued push to improve the education students receive in their elementary and secondary schooling. This emphasizes quite clearly how closely linked K-12 and postsecondary education are. The Clinton-Gore Administration's efforts over the past eight years to raise K-12 standards nationwide, strengthen teaching, help every child read well and independently by the third grade, boost math and science learning, and reform schools have established a strong foundation for preparing students to succeed in college, and we must continue to strengthen and build upon this foundation. Efforts to focus on a K-16 approach, such as GEAR UP, are essential.

Currently, there are more than 5.5 million students enrolled in educational programs at over 1,600 degree-granting community colleges across the country.[23] Although close to 80 percent intended at the time of admission to pursue a baccalaureate or post-baccalaureate degree, only 40 percent of them actually do transfer. Those who do transfer graduate at approximately the same rate (70 percent) as students who began at a four-year institution.[24]

Because America's racial and ethnic minorities are the fastest-growing sectors in the country and they make up a disproportionately large segment of the economically poor population, tending to their educational needs is in everyone's interest. The level of their educational achievements will dramatically affect the future of our nation. At present, African Americans and Hispanic Americans make up 22 percent of the general population, 19 percent of undergraduate enrollment, and 14 percent of undergraduate degrees.[25]

On the graduate level, these groups make up less than 12 percent of graduate enrollment, and 8 percent of graduate degrees.[26] At the U.S. Department of Education, we are deeply concerned at these low minority rates of participation in graduate education. Increasing demands from the new economy have tremendously enhanced the importance of graduate degrees for success in the 21st century—success for the individual and success for our country. We need to work to ensure that access to graduate education is available to all Americans. And our graduate schools must come to reflect the face of America, with the diverse racial and ethnic makeup that is one of our country's outstanding features.

We cannot expect to resolve access issues sequentially. Preparation for college; access to college; persistence and success in college; graduation; and graduate and professional education—these issues should be addressed comprehensively and simultaneously. Real access comprises admission, persistence, and success. This was affirmed again and again by participants in our *Agenda Project* dialogue sessions.

Students with Disabilities

Since the passage of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, the higher education community has made dramatic changes to provide access for students with disabilities on America's campuses. Millions of dollars have been spent to remove physical and programmatic barriers for students with disabilities by providing such aids or services as assistive technology, elevators, and student support centers. This, coupled with special education legislation that has helped many students succeed at the elementary and secondary school level, has resulted in unprecedented numbers of students with disabilities—892,000 in 1995-96—entering higher education settings.[27]

While much has been done, challenges remain. Students with disabilities, especially students with learning disabilities, leave secondary school with dim prospects. They tend to be under-educated and under-employed. Yet, if students with disabilities graduate from a four-year college and get a job, their income level is as competitive as that of their non-disabled peers. However, students with disabilities are less likely to enroll in postsecondary education than high school graduates without disabilities. Despite being qualified, they are less likely to enroll in a four-year college program. The majority of students who enroll in a two-year program with the intention of transferring to a four-year program do not, and students with disabilities are less likely to persist in earning a postsecondary degree or credential than their peers without disabilities.[28]

Respondents told us that students need to be prepared for college through discrete teaching. As one *Agenda Project* participant said, "These kids really need something like a halfway house to get them ready for college." Another added, "Students walk around campus for weeks and keep repeating…it is just so different, and they don't know how to cope. Secondary schools are not getting them ready."

The Clinton-Gore Administration, Congress, and the U.S. Department of Education have been working to improve academic preparation, so that all students are ready for postsecondary education.

Improving Academic Preparation

Over the past eight years, the Clinton-Gore Administration has established a broad range of programs aimed at improving K-16 education. One recent U.S. Department of Education initiative, GEAR UP, helps high-poverty middle schools, universities, and community-based organizations work together in new partnerships to encourage young people to have high expectations, stay in school, study hard, and take the right courses to

go to college. The GEAR UP initiative will help more than 700,000 disadvantaged middle-school students in 2001 get—and stay—on track for college success.[29]

Our TRIO programs (originally a group of three programs that has been expanded over the years to eight) provide grants to schools and organizations that help students build the skills they need to get into and succeed in college, and even move on to graduate school. For instance, the TRIO Upward Bound program provides eligible students with fundamental support—from instruction, to tutoring and counseling, to help with applications for financial aid and admission—aimed at helping them prepare for and reach postsecondary education. Like all of the TRIO programs, Upward Bound is targeted at a group of students who face particular challenges in obtaining access to postsecondary education—low-income students and those whose parents have not graduated from college.

Another group of programs addresses the second access concern—building capacity for quality postsecondary education. The Department's Institutional Development programs support improvements in educational quality, management, and financial stability at qualifying postsecondary institutions. Funding is focused on minority-serving institutions and others that enroll large proportions of financially disadvantaged students and have low per-student expenditures. The programs provide financial assistance that helps institutions solve problems that threaten their survival, improves their management and fiscal operations, and builds endowments.

The Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) is an OPE program that encourages educators at all institutions to propose new ways of ensuring postsecondary access, retention, and completion. Improvements in rates of retention and program completion are vitally important, especially for low-income and minority students, whose success rates continue to lag behind those of other groups.[30]

All these OPE programs, and others, form the basis for a successful undergraduate education experience. If our economy is to remain competitive in a global economy, if our democracy is to thrive in a changing world, we need to prepare our students for a challenging future.

To help parents and students find the appropriate institution of higher learning, the National Center on Education Statistics (NCES) operates the new College Opportunities On-Line (COOL) Web site. There, students can find information on more than 5,500 postsecondary institutions—from small technical colleges to the nation's largest and most prestigious universities. For each college, the Web site provides tuition and financial aid statistics, a list of the degrees offered, available fields of study, and more.

The American dream offers opportunity to all Americans who are willing to work hard and to play by the rules. That is a cornerstone of American culture and America's strength. Access to quality education from kindergarten through graduate school and beyond is the key to opportunity for all Americans. If the American dream remains out of the reach of the poor or students with disabilities, it is largely because many of them

don't have access to quality education. We're working to change that, and part of the effort involves listening to our stakeholders.

WHAT WE HEARD FROM STAKEHOLDERS

Respondents said that American students entering postsecondary education often are inadequately prepared to benefit fully from the experience. **As one participant said, "Postsecondary education issues are intimately connected with K-12 education issues." Another added, "Most people have trouble thinking about them in isolation from one another."** In other words, participants clearly indicated that postsecondary education and K-12 are inextricably linked. What happens in the early years is vitally important in determining future opportunities and choices in postsecondary education.

Respondents said there is still much to do to resolve longstanding inequities in opportunity for many groups of Americans—Native Americans, Hispanics, African Americans, and economically disadvantaged citizens. Respondents felt that too many students have low expectations because they are unaware of available opportunities. Adequately publicizing these opportunities—so that every American knows that if she or he works hard, postsecondary education is possible—has proven to be difficult, but absolutely necessary.

Through the *Agenda Project*, we also heard much about the challenges students with disabilities face in postsecondary education, including problems of preparation, perception, technology, and capacity and resources.

NATIONAL AGENDA OPPORTUNITIES

Participants in our dialogue sessions identified a number of problems—and policy responses. They said that:

1. As the "Baby Boom Echo" matures and lifelong learning becomes increasingly common, we can expect a massive influx of students into postsecondary education. Increasing access for a rapidly growing and increasingly diverse population will tax the capacity of our education system. Not increasing access would have even more serious social and economic consequences.

2. Too many students reach college ill-prepared to succeed there. Opening up access to quality postsecondary education for all Americans requires a continued and intensified emphasis on preparation for college and stronger relationships between colleges and universities and K-12 schools.

3. Access to graduate and professional education is now the new frontier in American higher education. Although many graduate students are supported by federal research funding, the U.S. Department of Education's present investment in graduate education is only 5 percent of its total investment in postsecondary education: $100 million in program dollars out of a $17 billion budget for

postsecondary education and $2.5 billion in graduate student loans out of a total loan volume of over $40 billion.

4. The digital divide, the gap in technology access along economic and ethnic lines, is a reality not only in American homes but also in American postsecondary institutions. The Administration's work to address the disparity at the elementary and secondary level through initiatives like the E-rate needs to be extended to the postsecondary level.

5. Increased opportunities for students with disabilities means they are participating in postsecondary education in rapidly increasing numbers. But too many faculty lack the knowledge, understanding, and instructional strategies, and institutions lack the resources, to serve these students effectively.

6. Campuses still lag far behind in the use of technology that meets the requirements of universal design, and we know too little about effective software for students with disabilities, especially students with learning disabilities.

OPE ACTIONS

In partnership with the postsecondary education community, the U.S. Department of Education can support excellence in postsecondary education for low-income, minority, and students with disabilities by considering the following steps:

1. OPE should continue to increase its emphasis on K-16 programs (such as GEAR UP and TRIO) that encourage students to think early about college, take the right classes, and begin financial planning. Through partnerships at the local level and partnerships with foundations and businesses, we can leverage federal dollars even more effectively. The more these partnerships focus on systemic change, the greater the effect.

2. OPE should consider activities that expand on initiatives like the E-rate to bring technology more quickly and pervasively to postsecondary institutions that serve underserved populations, perhaps through our Institutional Development programs.

3. OPE should expand its focus to pay far more attention to graduate education and international education than it has in the past.

4. OPE should advocate for research on the value of software and technology based learning for postsecondary students with disabilities, in particular for students with learning disabilities.

5. OPE should work with accreditation bodies and federal entities with governance authority regarding the Americans with Disabilities Act and the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

6. OPE should convene meetings with leaders in postsecondary schools who are knowledgeable about students with disabilities and can make recommendations regarding a seamless K-16 system for all students.

Theme 2

ACCESS: EXAMINING ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES IN PAYING FOR COLLEGE

Research has shown that student aid is one of the best social investments we can make. It makes a tremendous difference in the lives of individuals. It also gives society a great return on capital in increased tax revenues alone, not to mention increased economic productivity.

OPE *Agenda Project* Dialogue Session Participant

Rising Expectations

During the 19th century the "common school movement" pushed for an elementary school education for white children. Reformers argued that school was necessary for economic prosperity and the civic health of the nation. This led to the establishment of state boards of education and public financing for education. It was expected that children go to elementary school. By the turn of the century, the push was on for high school attendance. From 1890 to 1930, the percent of teenagers aged fourteen to seventeen enrolled in high school rose from 4 percent to 47 percent. In time, this expectation became mandatory. Now, all states have some sort of law mandating school attendance to a certain age, and the schooling is paid for by the state.

Today, in the information age, postsecondary education is not yet mandatory, but it certainly is viewed as more and more of a necessity by American families. They see noticeably higher earnings and much lower unemployment rates for individuals who have gone on to college. In fact, on average, a bachelor's degree is worth an estimated $600,000 more over a lifetime than a high school diploma.[31] Americans want the opportunities provided by college for their children and themselves.

College-going rates are at an all-time high; unfortunately, while all groups have shown increased college attendance, significant gaps still exist between the haves and have-nots. Low-income individuals and minorities are still much less likely to go on to college than their higher income counterparts. If they do enroll, they are less likely to succeed. In 1997, 67 percent of high school graduates entered college immediately after high school—57 percent of low-income high school graduates compared to 82 percent of high-income high school graduates.[32] Inadequate academic preparation and a complex system of financing postsecondary education contribute to this college opportunity gap.

The Financial Burden for Families

Paying for college looms over families, especially at-risk families who may have had little or no experience with college. They see tuitions rising faster than inflation and

family income. And they are worried about whether college will be affordable for them. People generally see college prices as just too high.

Postsecondary opportunities are wide and varied in this country. More than 7,000 institutions exist, ranging from local community colleges to vocational training institutions to four-year public and private colleges to major research universities. Increasingly, distance-learning opportunities are available at traditional institutions as well as newly created virtual institutions.

The prices charged by institutions—referred to as sticker prices—also vary: in 1999-2000 the average annual tuition and fees charged at two-year public institutions were $1,627; at public four-year institutions the average was $3,356 for in-state students and $15,380 for private four-year colleges and universities. The average price (including tuition, fees, room, and board) for four-year public institutions represents 61 percent of family income for low-income families; 17 percent for middle-income families; and 5 percent for the high-income group. The average price for four-year private institutions represents 162 percent of family income for low-income families; 44 percent for middle-income families; and 14 percent for the high-income group.[33]

Many students apply for and receive financial aid—grants, loans, work-study jobs, and new tax breaks—that helps to reduce the amount that families and students must pay out of pocket. This net price actually paid by students and families is often significantly below the sticker price. Due to significant increases in aid under the Clinton-Gore Administration, net price has risen more slowly than sticker price in recent years.[34] Even so, both measures of price have risen faster than family incomes, meaning that families are now paying a larger share of their income for college. (Unfortunately, detailed up-to-date data on net price by family income are not available.)

Polls show that many Americans do not have an accurate picture of what college actually costs. They consistently overestimate the sticker price of college and underestimate the financial resources available to them to pay for college because they do not know what is available to them through different forms of aid.

So much attention is paid each fall to the prices charged by the most expensive private institutions that many Americans have skewed views of the cost of college. Private institutions account, however, for only 2 out of every 10 undergraduate students enrolled in the 3,500 colleges and universities.[35] Most students attend public institutions, whose tuition and fees are much lower. In 1999-2000 more than 50 percent of all undergraduates attended institutions that charged tuition and fees of $4,000 or less per year and only 7 percent attended institutions charging tuition and fees of $20,000 or higher.[36]

Although the Department of Education has made significant strides in simplifying the financial aid application process—cutting the instructions in half—obtaining student aid has long been a complicated process of determining what a family should be able to pay

for their family members' education and their eligibility for different types of aid. As a result of a trend established in the 1980s, more than half of all student financial aid now provided to students and their families comes in the form of loans, which must be repaid after leaving school. Paying it back can take some time, although several recent initiatives have lowered borrowing costs for students and their families. A recent U.S. Department of Education study indicates that four years after graduating, only 16 percent of those students who had borrowed money were debt free. Of those participating in the federal survey, 51 percent had debt from a variety of sources averaging $10,000.[37] Despite increases in student borrowing, the Clinton-Gore Administration has lowered default rates on federal loans from 22.4 percent in fiscal year 1990 to 6.9 percent in fiscal year 1998.[38]

A Complex Financing System

Paying for college is based on a decades-old model of shared responsibility—students, parents, the federal government, states, and private organizations all have a role to play. This contrasts with the universal availability of free public education at the K-12 level regardless of income**.**

In postsecondary education, states pay a significant share of the costs of public colleges and universities so that the tuition and fees charged students are well below the actual costs, and far below the fees at private institutions. **The federal government helps to provide equal access across income groups through the provision of grants, low-cost loans, work-study jobs, and, more recently, tax credits.** Students and their families pay a portion of the costs depending on their family income and the kind of institutions they attend. Private organizations, including colleges and universities, also provide financial assistance to students.

Although shared responsibility remains the general approach of our current system, it has evolved in such a way that it is not clear who has what responsibility or how the pieces match up with each other. The entire system of college financing is based on incremental changes over several decades, without a comprehensive reexamination. Even though we have many part-time students and more adults going back to college over their lifetimes, our systems have not been examined carefully to make adjustments for the changing learners.

If postsecondary education is becoming the norm, who should pay for it and through what mechanisms – grants, loans, tax credits or tax deductions? What prices should students and parents pay? How much should states and the federal government pay? California recently announced a plan to pay the fees of low-income students with good grades, at a cost to the state that could exceed $1 billion a year. California is the first state, but may not be the last, to make such a comprehensive guarantee.

Over the past 40 years, federal policy parameters have been changed without enough thought about how they interact with the policy parameters of the states, which finance large elements of the system, and vice versa. Changes, expansions, and improvements are

made piecemeal and tacked onto the existing system, generating an increasingly complex system of public/private financing that is difficult to understand and navigate. The resulting confusion means that students and parents often do not know what their real options are, especially at-risk groups who have had limited exposure to postsecondary education.

Expanded Federal Investment

At the federal level, student financial aid has grown dramatically during the past seven years. Overall, the Clinton-Gore commitment to opening the doors of college is the largest federal investment in higher education since the G.I. Bill. The Clinton-Gore Administration has more than doubled student aid to more than $50 billion in aid for students today. Three-quarters of the aid is in loans, with the rest predominantly in grants. The new tax credits for postsecondary education—HOPE and Lifetime Learning—provided nearly 5 million taxpayers with $3.5 million in tax relief in 1998, the first year that these new benefits were available. When fully phased in, this program will provide $6 billion a year to help America's families pay for college. More than one-half of full-time, full-year undergraduate students now receive some form of financial aid.[39] Seventy percent of all student financial aid comes from the federal government. The new Lifetime Learning tax credit is a big step in providing more access for part-time students at any point in their lifetime and as many times as they wish to use it.

The new 1994 Direct Student Loan program delivers loans to students more quickly, simply, and cheaply. Together, students and taxpayers have already saved $18 billion through student loan reforms, in both the Direct Student Loan program and the Guaranteed Loan program (FFEL).[40] Pell Grants, the foundation of assistance for low-income students, were initially tied to providing a certain portion of costs for families below certain levels; these ties have been lost over time. Since the early 1980s, loans have grown significantly, in part, because they are cheaper to provide and, in part, because they are entitlements. This has resulted in what many have termed the "loan-grant" imbalance.

The need analysis system—the system of determining what families and students can be expected to pay—has also evolved over time with little careful reexamination of the underlying goals and principles to take into account new students, including lifelong learners, and new modes of educational delivery, including distance learners. The current system is still based on the initial 1954 model, even though it has become more and more complex as Congress writes more detail and specificity into the law each time a reauthorization occurs. Because of the way the system is structured, students cannot apply early for aid, thereby adding to their uncertainty of aid eligibility. The earliest students can now apply for fall semester aid is January, when they have their tax returns completed. They typically need to wait until the spring to find out what financial aid they will receive.

This web of complexity is difficult to navigate; every applicant must fill out a long detailed form. It is not at all clear that the added complexity gains much—if anything—in

more accurately reflecting financial need. But it certainly does contribute to the misconceptions of many Americans about what aid they are eligible to receive. Thus, the need analysis system and the form are impediments to full access.

We are taking steps to improve the system. In July 2000, the U.S. Department of Education signed a unique incentive-based information technology contract with a private contractor. The contract is to modernize the Student Financial Assistance Office's loan systems, which handle more than $52 billion in loans per year. The contractor will be paid a percentage of the savings, not a fee upfront. The contract is the first of its kind. The central data system's 12 functions will be reduced to seven and incorporated into the other systems. It is expected these changes to the system will save $40 million to $50 million over the next four years

Re-creating Regulatory Reform

Student aid requirements have mired institutions and the Department itself in a Web of complexity that threatens our capacity to administer effectively. The Higher Education Act, when enacted in 1965, consisted of 52 pages. Today, it comes in at 497. The growth in the amount and extent of implementing regulations has kept pace with the growth of the Act itself.

New student aid and other programs that are important to providing access and opportunities for innovation in higher education are one cause in the growth of the Act, a very positive one. However, these are balanced by more and more requirements governing the administration of student aid, many of which were deemed necessary to correct lapses in program integrity by often a small number of institutions. New approaches to regulation, such as negotiated rulemaking that involves representatives from the various groups of Title IV stakeholders, have helped to craft regulations that are somewhat more workable. However, these approaches have continued to focus on the details of administering Title IV aid and not the overall structure of the requirements.

Examining this body of requirements to determine how they might be refocused to simplify the administration of student aid is a forbidding task with an uncertain result. The task itself—to relieve the administrative burden and at the same time to provide the protections needed to assure the integrity of the programs—would be difficult in and of itself. In addition, it would be difficult to reach any broad consensus on the direction of change among the higher education community, and equally difficult to gain the support necessary to amend the Higher Education Act to effect the change. It would also be a long task; the first phase would lead up to the next authorization of the Higher Education Act. However, if there is not the will among the stakeholders to begin this task now, the only alternative will be to add to the growing complexity as new issues arise in the student aid programs.

Responding to these challenges must be a shared responsibility. The public and the private sectors, non-profit and for-profit institutions, corporate and entrepreneurial

entities, all must work individually and in partnership to make lifetime learning a reality for all Americans.

WHAT WE HEARD FROM STAKEHOLDERS

Participants in the *Agenda Project* dialogue sessions raised concerns about paying for college in many sessions and in many different ways. They recognized and fully supported the increasing need for all Americans to have real postsecondary opportunities, opportunities available to the lowest-income groups as well as higher-income groups. But they worried whether the situation was improving or worsening. Underlying the concerns raised by participants were basic questions of who should pay for college. How should the responsibility be shared? Should the K-12 model of free public education be extended to postsecondary education? Or should individuals pay a significant share, since the economic benefit primarily accrues to them?

NATIONAL AGENDA OPPORTUNITIES

The primary issues raised by *Agenda Project* dialogue sessions include:

1. How individuals and families pay for college is a major concern for most Americans, especially as more Americans view a college education as a necessity for their children and themselves. Rising college prices heighten concerns that college will be unaffordable in the future.

2. Families and students are borrowing more to pay for college at the same time that funding for Pell Grants has also grown. While the reliance on loans has increased, many recent initiatives have reduced the costs of student loans for borrowers and their families. Even with reduced costs of borrowing, however, this shift towards loans—often called the "loan-grant" imbalance—raises concerns about too much borrowing. Many participants expressed concern about the effects of indebtedness on students' abilities to attend college and their career choices after leaving school, especially their ability to choose lower-paying professions, such as teaching or community service. Increased support for grants as well as more generous income-contingent repayment mechanisms and forgiveness were raised in many sessions.

3. College enrollment is at its highest level ever and will continue to grow significantly in future years due to demographic changes and increased demand. Unfortunately, however, the gap between low-income and high-income groups and between minority and majority students is still too wide. Increased demand coupled with more students from disadvantaged backgrounds will put pressure on the entire postsecondary education system. If government budgets and the willingness of taxpayers—at local, state, and

federal levels—to provide additional funds do not match future needs, we could end up with reduced rather than expanded access.

4. Lifelong learning is essential to help Americans adjust to the changing demands of the job market throughout their lives. Flexible educational arrangements—including part-time, anytime, anywhere opportunities—are essential. The need to help students pay for lifelong learning was raised as an important concern. The new Lifetime Learning tax credit provides important relief; other opportunities should also be explored.

5. Many Americans do not have the accurate information they need to plan for college, from information about the courses they should take to accurate information about availability of financial aid.

6. The process of determining student eligibility is so complex and highly detailed that it is difficult for students and families to have an accurate picture of the availability of financial aid, especially in a timely fashion. Even the simplified Free Application for Student Financial Aid remains daunting to many.

7. Student aid requirements—whether regulatory or statutorily-based—continue to be of concern, especially as they relate to the system's flexibility to adapt to changes in new student demands for more flexible learning arrangements and the use of new technologies to deliver aid. Many participants in the sessions were very appreciative of the progress the Department has made in reducing regulatory burdens but would like to see even more changes.

OPE ACTIONS

It is time to reexamine our overall postsecondary education student financing system. Postsecondary education ought to be a leader in helping to shape the future, not a follower. We must do everything possible to eliminate disparities in college attendance rates across groups. Therefore, the following options, some of which build upon recent initiatives of the Administration, should be carefully considered.

1. The U.S. Department of Education should lead a dialogue on how postsecondary education should be financed. College presidents, leaders in national and state governments, students, economists, and business and community leaders should discuss how all the partners could share in helping to make college accessible for Americans from all groups. This examination and analysis should provide a road map for change in the next decade.

   Questions to be addressed should include: Should there be options for free public postsecondary education? If not, what should students and parents pay? How much should states and the federal government pay? What are the likely financial resources to be available to states and the federal government? How

does this interact with expected demand, including increased demand from groups who are likely to be less well prepared? What is the role for private sources? What is the mix of aid—how do institutional subsidies, grants to students, loans, and tax policy interact? What is the appropriate balance among different sources of aid? How do all these questions and answers vary for different groups of students? What are the intergenerational issues—how do different options affect different generations? Are these the appropriate ways to transfer benefits across generations?

2. OPE should create a study group to examine the student aid system and the need analysis system. Its charge would be to design a simplified, easy-to-understand system that reflects the realities of today's education and students and is flexible to meet tomorrow's needs.

   This group would look at more detailed and more technical issues than the first group. Simplification would be the overriding goal: easier and earlier determination of need and aid eligibility. A simplified need analysis system—fewer variables, less open to gaming and unintended consequences, easier to understand and file, earlier application dates so students would know their eligibility earlier, adjustments for new modes of educational delivery and new types of students, and new sources of aid, such as tax credits—would be the goal here.

   The system for delivering aid should also be examined, particularly the design and delivery of loans. The existence of two major loan programs since 1993—Direct Student Loans and FFEL—has benefited students by providing students better benefits and service and reduced federal costs. We are at a crossroads, however, where a careful examination and analysis is needed on the future delivery of student loans. Income-contingent repayment (ICR) and the specific formula being used also need reexamination.

3. Building on its Think College Early campaign, the Department of Education should mount a major public information campaign with its partners to ensure that all Americans know what college opportunities are available, how much they cost, and what aid is available to meet the costs.

   Despite the fact that much information is already available to students and families, many Americans are quite uninformed or have misconceptions about the true opportunities. The need for more public awareness to ensure that families know the real facts about college prices and student financial aid was raised many times in *Agenda Project* sessions. This information needs to be broadly available, especially to more at-risk students in the middle school years when they are making key choices about what classes to take, decisions that will affect their chances of college success in future years.

4. OPE should examine the role of student loans in helping families to pay for college and the effects of debt burden on students' decisions about whether and where to go on to postsecondary education, and on their choices after leaving school regarding careers and graduate education. This effort should examine the effectiveness of different repayment options, including income-contingent repayment, and other alternatives, such as loan forgiveness. Possible options for changes in the next reauthorization of the Higher Education Act should be considered.

5. OPE should undertake a major effort to encourage lifelong learning, including an examination of what is occurring now and what the barriers are to more lifelong learning. This effort should look at administrative, regulatory, and statutory barriers.

6. OPE, together with its partners in postsecondary education and industry, should mount a major effort to examine the complex requirements now surrounding the student aid programs. The effort should examine ways to reduce requirements and increase flexibility to deal with new student demands and technologies while continuing to ensure accountability for taxpayer dollars. This effort should look at administrative, regulatory, and statutory barriers, including recommendations for the next reauthorization.

Theme 3

IMPROVING TEACHER QUALITY

Every community should have a talented and dedicated teacher in every classroom. We have an enormous opportunity for ensuring teacher quality well into the 21st century, if we recruit promising people into teaching and give them the highest quality preparation and training.

President Clinton's Call to Action for American Education in the 21st Century

For decades, the public and private sectors have explored methods to improve teacher quality. Thinks tanks, commissions, and agencies across the country have probed the problem, from the seminal 1983 report *A Nation at Risk*, to the 1991 Department of Labor SCANS report, the Hunt Commission Report of 1996 to today's CEO Forum and the Web-based Education Commission, and many more. All recognize the critical importance of the teacher in today's society and call for improvements in teacher training. The need is especially critical today since the classroom has changed so radically in recent years.

Harold O. Levy, chancellor of New York City public schools, is particularly blunt about the problem and the urgency. He wrote in a *New York Times* (9-9-2000) opinion column, "The quality of teachers has been declining for decades, and no one wants to talk about it." He lists many of the problems, particularly lack of adequate pay and respect, and concludes with a warning, **"This may be our last opportunity to avoid locking in mediocrity for a generation."**

In the last eight years, the Clinton-Gore Administration has not only been talking about the problem, but also begun doing something about it. A consensus is now emerging that the issue is one not only for state and local governments, but also for the federal government.

Contemporary classrooms and social conditions confront teachers with a range of complex challenges. These include meeting the needs of students who have difficulty adapting to the school environment and may be at risk of violent behavior. New education goals and tougher standards, more rigorous assessments, greater interest in parental involvement, and expanded use of technology increase the knowledge and skills that teaching demands. These challenges are great, and neither teacher training programs nor state licensing requirements are effective in helping teachers to work in this environment.

The Clinton-Gore Administration has recognized that, as a society, we need to make dramatic changes in the ways we recruit, prepare, license, and provide ongoing support for teachers. It has been nearly thirty years since the Federal government last made a major investment in teacher recruitment and preparation. The three Teacher Quality

Enhancement Grant Programs created in 1998 in Title II of the Higher Education Act, the teacher accountability system also enacted in Title II, and the new Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers to Use Technology program all give us another historic chance to improve the quality of teaching in America's classrooms.

The Current State of Teacher Preparation

There is a good deal of diversity among the approximately 1,200 institutions that prepare teachers in the United States.[41] They vary significantly in size; the number of teachers they produce each year can range from one to nearly 2,000. They also vary in structure and quality. **Unlike other professions that require national accreditation of professional schools, less than one-half of teacher education institutions—only about 500 institutions—are currently accredited by a national accrediting body.[42]**

Teacher preparation programs are often underfunded and too focused on theory at the expense of classroom practice. They frequently are disconnected from the arts and sciences and from elementary and secondary schools. The National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (NCTAF) report found "long-standing problems with traditional teacher education programs," including superficial curriculum and the teaching of theory separately from its applications. In addition, many of those preparing our nation's teachers have not taught at the K-12 level in many years and thus have no experience with the range and depth of the problems that new teachers face in the classroom. More than 50 percent of teacher educators report that it has been more than 15 years since they were K-12 teachers.[43]

Standards for Teachers

Standards for entry into the teaching profession are generally low. While forty-four states require candidates for licenses to pass a standardized test, the examinations required, for the most part, are not rigorous, and pass scores tend to be low.[44] In addition, the demand for teachers is such that states routinely waive their standards and allow districts to hire individuals who don't meet licensure requirements. About 30 percent of newly hired teachers enter the profession without having fully met state standards for licensure.[45]

Even when teachers are fully qualified, they are too often required to teach subjects for which they have little or no academic preparation. Thirteen percent of public school teachers of core academic subjects in grades 7-12 are teaching "out of field" in their main teaching assignment.[46] **In high-poverty schools (those with more than 50 percent of students receiving free or reduced-price lunch), teachers are twice as likely to be out of field than in low-poverty schools (22 percent vs. 11 percent).[47]**

Inadequate Support for Teachers

Teachers recognize the need for change. Most teachers do not feel adequately prepared for the realities of today's classrooms—addressing the needs of diverse students and those with special needs, integrating technology into instruction, and teaching to challenging standards.

The results reported in a 1999 National Center for Education Statistics report, *Teacher Quality: A Report on the Preparation and Qualifications of Public School Teachers*, are not surprising. The study asked teachers with three or fewer years of experience whether they were prepared to integrate technology; meet the needs of diverse students and those with limited English proficiency; address the needs of special education students; and implement curriculum and performance standards. In each case, fewer than 30 percent of the new teachers reported feeling "very well prepared."[48]

In addition to inadequate preparation, many new teachers do not receive the support they need in order to succeed. Too often, they are left to "sink or swim." Although more than 50 percent of first-year public school teachers participate in some type of induction program, the quality and scope of the programs range from comprehensive to cursory. Too often, new teachers are given the toughest assignments—the classes that no one else wants to teach and the extracurricular activities that other teachers do not want to supervise.[49] No wonder **approximately 22 percent of new public school teachers leave the profession in the first three years.**[50]

Lack of Professional Development for Experienced Teachers

Experienced teachers have too few opportunities to improve their knowledge and skills, and their professional development opportunities are second rate. Professional development remains largely short-term, non-collaborative, and unrelated to their needs and the achievement challenges faced by their students. Teachers continue to be offered professional development opportunities that last fewer than 8 hours, despite the fact that teachers report that professional development with a longer duration is more effective.

U.S. teachers devote more time (57.8 hours in a two-week period) to direct teacher-student academic instruction than do teachers in Japan (44 hours) and Germany (38.5 hours).[51] **Our nation's schools typically spend only 1 percent to 3 percent of their resources on teacher development, compared to significantly higher expenditures by both American corporations and schools in other countries.**[52]

Federal Efforts

Over the past eight years, the Clinton-Gore Administration has promoted rigorous standards, supported high-quality professional development, increased accountability, and helped states and districts recruit, prepare, and induct new teachers. Because other changes in school organization may have little impact on student achievement if teaching methods are not systematically adapted and improved, the Administration has made improving teacher quality a top priority.

For the first time in almost 30 years, the Federal government is investing in the recruitment, preparation, mentoring, and support of new teachers. Among the investments that directly affect teachers are the new Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant program and the Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers to Use Technology program. These initiatives support systemic efforts to improve the quality of teacher preparation and training and, in turn, the quality of instruction and student achievement. The Department is also implementing a new teacher accountability system that requires institutions and states to report on the outcomes of their teacher preparation programs.

In 1999, the Teacher Quality program awarded 28 teacher recruitment grants to help high-need school districts recruit and prepare 3,000 new teachers; 25 partnership grants to improve the preparation of over 17,000 new teachers; and 24 state grants to support systematic efforts to improve the quality of teaching.[53] The Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers program awarded 225 consortium grants to support implementation and infusion of technology into the preparation and field experiences of 400,000 future teachers.[54] Title II grants awarded in FY 2000 support seven new states and eight more partnerships.[55]

To support greater communication and cooperation among the many parties involved in recruiting, preparing, and inducting teachers to ensure that they are prepared to teach in the 21st century, the Department has organized a series of first-ever nationwide conferences. The President's Summit in 1999 convened college and university presidents from across the country to discuss their role in elevating the importance and improving the quality of teacher preparation on their campuses. Building on the Summit, the National Conference on Teacher Quality in January 2000 assembled more than 1,000 higher education leaders with K-12 and community leaders to develop action plans for improving teacher education. Four regional summer institutes focused on implementation of these plans.

Teacher Academies and Other Strategies

One idea rapidly catching on here and abroad is the teacher academy. Often described as an exemplary approach to mentoring and induction for new teachers, teacher academies also provide high-quality professional development for currently practicing teachers. And, at a number of locations across the nation, the teacher academy concept has come to include programs to encourage high school students to prepare themselves for teaching careers.

Successful teacher academies include partnerships between schools and higher education institutions, a strong program framework that includes content knowledge and teaching skills, established times for LEA and IHE teachers and administrators for program planning and implementation, and regular evaluation of program outcomes.

For new teachers, teacher academies offer workshops to induct them into the school system and to promote their professional growth and provide support from experienced

teacher mentors. For veteran teachers, an academy might provide training in how to use technology effectively in the classroom or forums that assist teachers in working with the particular challenges posed in teaching in urban schools or in preparing for leadership positions. Academies are also helping to redesign teacher education training programs by working with partner school districts and charter schools to develop new course models, especially for reading and writing, math, and science. Title II grants the Department has made to the Teacher Academy of South Texas, the Milwaukee Partnership Academy for Teacher Quality, and Saginaw Valley State University are supporting development of such programs. Another Title II grant to Miami-Dade public schools and partner institutions is designed to help address the problem of the teacher shortage by providing high school students training and experience in teaching.

Many programs are experimenting with new ideas. Some have been doing it for years. Several schools have long provided Master of Arts in Teaching programs. These allow college graduates with strong backgrounds in academic disciplines to learn teaching skills and pedagogical theory in one year. To encourage pursuit of teaching careers, one school takes 82 undergraduates per year and puts them on track to graduate in 4.5 years with a teaching certificate—and $20,000 in cash, half to be spent at the school where the graduate teaches, half to be spent as the teacher sees fit.

Across the Atlantic, the Open University of the United Kingdom has an innovative program that enables working adults to train for new careers in teaching. The principles underpinning the program include: supported open learning; partnership with schools and the University; tight integration of academic study and school placements; strong focus on professional competencies as standards; assessment and training positioned in schools; emphasis on the use of the Web for delivery; and a close match between directed units of study for trainees based on an individual needs assessment. This model taps a new market for teachers—working adults—which is too seldom tapped in the U.S. If a clerk from Liverpool can stay in her hometown, keep her day job, study at night via distance learning, student-teach in a local school and be placed in one when she is licensed, why can't we do that here in the U.S.?

In sum, there are approaches that offer innovative strategies to improve teacher skills, build school-college partnerships and attract more people into the teaching profession. It would also help if the well-known colleges and universities across this country that have dropped teacher certification programs in the last decade would reverse their decisions. This would be a very practical step, as well as a symbolic one that would signal the value of teaching to prospective candidates.

But more needs to be done.

WHAT WE HEARD FROM STAKEHOLDERS

Nearly every *Agenda Project* focus group raised one or more teacher quality issues. In some cases, participants touched on the impact the preparation of teachers has in other areas such as workforce preparation, student readiness for college, general awareness of international issues, or K-12 school success. Many participants noted the disconnect that now exists across the country between the demographic diversity of the classroom and that of the current teaching force. As one participant said, "Postsecondary education issues are intimately connected with K-12 education issues." Another added, "Most people have trouble thinking about them in isolation from one another."

In every session, ideas were offered for addressing these problems. A common theme was to enhance the role played by the U.S. Department of Education and OPE in several broad areas. One is funding support for teacher preparation program improvements. Others include financial aid incentives to attract students into teaching; funds to encourage K-16 partnerships focused on teacher preparation and improved K-12 student achievement; and using OPE resources and leadership to disseminate promising practices in teacher preparation reform. Another theme cited in many focus group sessions was the importance of U.S. Department of Education encouragement of college and university leaders to assume responsibility for successful high-quality preparation of new teachers. High-quality teacher preparation must be a university-wide mission that includes leadership from the presidents, trustees, and academic officers in the institution.

NATIONAL AGENDA OPPORTUNITIES

The national dialogue on teacher quality and the future of postsecondary education in the United States targeted these issues and challenges:

1. Over the next decade, America's schools will need to hire 2.2 million teachers, over half of whom will be first-time teachers. Many schools already face shortages of qualified teachers, especially in high-poverty communities and in subjects such as math and science. Postsecondary institutions that train educators must work in partnership with schools, states, and communities to recruit teachers, build the capacity to train them, support them as new teachers in the classroom, and ensure that they meet high standards of professionalism.

2. America's teacher education programs do not adequately prepare teachers to meet the needs of all students—including those with disabilities and students from diverse ethnic and socioeconomic backgrounds.

3. Too many students are taught by uncertified teachers, those teaching out of field, and teachers with weak training in the disciplines they teach.

4. Too many teachers lack proficiency with incorporating technology and international issues into their teaching. Teachers need better pre-service and in-

service training in these areas, and even university educators need professional development on using technology.

5. Teachers remain underpaid, teach under very poor working conditions, and receive inadequate support—especially new teachers entering the classroom. These factors make both recruitment and retention of teachers difficult.

6. Too few educators and administrators across the country are aware of promising practices or programs that work, and there is too little awareness of the impact of good teaching on student learning.

OPE ACTIONS

Teachers want help in bringing high standards into their classrooms. OPE should take additional actions.

1. OPE should support partnerships among K-12 schools and postsecondary institutions to create comprehensive change in education.

2. OPE should work with states to find ways for mid-career professionals to prepare for and enter teaching more easily, while maintaining and raising certification standards.

3. OPE should encourage higher education leaders to get involved in teacher preparation reform: the data on subject matter competence of new teachers and student performance on tests with rigorous standards show that the entire university must be behind quality teacher training.

4. OPE should work with national organizations and other institutions to facilitate closer integration of teacher colleges with the entire university.

5. OPE should gather and disseminate up-to-date information about innovative teacher preparation practices; many institutions have tackled aspects of the quality-teaching puzzle and their work should be identified and publicized widely.

6. OPE should convene forums on teacher quality issues at state and regional levels: higher visibility for the core issues of teacher quality will draw state and other leaders into the reform process.

7. OPE should promote GEAR UP as part of a broad strategy to attract students into teaching, especially minority students: these students often have strong ties to their community and want to practice their professions in the places where they grew up.

8. OPE should provide effective outreach about funding opportunities in OPE, and technical assistance for institutions with limited grant-seeking experience.

9. OPE should involve foundations, businesses, states, universities, and other partners in carefully designed efforts to fund comprehensive approaches to teacher quality improvement: federal leadership can bring other important partners to the table and accelerate the pace of change.

10. OPE should promote the effective integration of technology into curriculum and instructional practices on the university campus and in the school classroom.

11. OPE should consider a grant competition to encourage states, or regional partnerships, to build on some of the creative ideas that are being tried to improve teacher training. Whatever the final form, one goal of the program would be to break down the current barriers that separate the main postsecondary institution from the college of education.

As Secretary of Education Richard Riley has said many times, "We know that the single most important factor in a child's education is a well-qualified teacher."

Theme 4

INTEGRATING TECHNOLOGY AND DISTANCE EDUCATION INTO THE CURRICULUM

Managing the impact of technology on higher education is bigger than any of us. There is a real need for national leadership in this area.

OPE *Agenda Project* Dialogue Participant

Persons of a certain age can remember the time when the thought of visiting 5,500 postsecondary institutions would have been considered laughable. Not anymore. Today, the new College Opportunities On-Line (COOL) Web site (**www.ed.gov**) at the U.S. Department of Education displays information on 5,500 institutions—from small technical colleges to the nation's largest and most prestigious universities. A student can search by size, type, specialty, or location. It is a small yet significant example of how technology is changing education.

Postsecondary educators have been quick to adopt the increasingly sophisticated technology tools. In its various forms, technology has enriched classroom instruction and stimulated the development of new models for delivering education.

According to a recent National Center for Education Statistics study, the number of distance courses offered by U.S. institutions and the number of enrollments nearly doubled between 1994-95 and 1997-98.[56] At the same time, technology has expanded the boundaries of research and brought important efficiencies to the management of institutions.

It is only recently, however, that technology has presented the potential for transforming not just the classroom but institutions themselves. The Internet extends the reach of institutions to undertake initiatives most educators would not have dreamed possible even five years ago. The Internet is also stimulating competition among a broad range of postsecondary providers, creating an emerging market-based higher education economy that will orient more closely postsecondary education to consumer needs and interests.

The Internet is the vehicle for change; the market is an American public that will demand continuing education that will provide the new knowledge our rapidly changing world of work requires. As a U.S. Department of Labor study recently pointed out**, "Of the 54 jobs expected to experience the most significant growth between now and 2005, only eight do not require technological fluency."**

This new market for postsecondary education will include the students whom institutions have traditionally served. However, it is adult students who will be the real drivers of change—demanding more flexible, even customized, self-paced learning opportunities. Distance or distributed education will be the primary response to this growing demand.

While the Internet provides perhaps the richest transforming educational resource since the invention of the printing press, the challenges in realizing the power of the Internet are substantial. One of the most significant challenges is the need for capital to invest in development, which is fostering new relationships between for-profit entities and non-profit and public institutions. Some institutions have founded their own for-profit entities to provide the capital required; others are looking to outside investors and partnerships.

Assuring Quality, Access, and Financing

Although these new relationships are important in enabling development, they are raising significant questions. How will these partnerships alter traditional assumptions about the nature of and values inherent in higher education? For example, the partnerships could increase the digital divide between the institutions that can afford sophisticated applications of technology in instruction and those that cannot.

OPE is determined to see that doesn't happen. The OPE programs to aid developing institutions [Titles III and V of the Higher Education Act (HEA)] support institutions that enroll many of our minority and disadvantaged students. OPE is working with grantees to help them use their funds to build the infrastructure for access to the Internet. The cost of technology is high, but students at all our institutions need access to essential computing resources.

In addition to the digital divide issue, all these changes raise new challenges concerning the two long-standing and primary concerns of the federal government: quality and access.

Quality assurance in American higher education has been predominantly the province of regional and national accrediting agencies, membership organizations that rely on self-examination and peer review to determine whether institutions meet minimum standards of quality and to encourage improvement. OPE's role is predicated on its authority to determine which postsecondary institutions are eligible for HEA Title IV student aid. The institutions eligible to offer federal student aid and to receive other federal funds must meet acceptable levels of quality. OPE recognizes accrediting agencies that have rigorous procedures for determining which institutions meet their standards and thereby become eligible for Title IV student aid.

Regional and national accrediting agencies are faced with the challenge of accurately evaluating postsecondary education over the Internet. OPE supports their efforts. For our part, we need to ensure that the criteria for recognizing accrediting agencies do not present obstacles to the changes accrediting agencies are making in their standards and processes.

Cyber University vs. Site-Based University

When distance education has been delivered by site-based institutions, OPE has not generally been concerned about the quality of their programs until the distance education courses top the 50 percent mark. These institutions have faculty to oversee the

curriculum, and long-standing traditions for dealing with matters of institutional integrity. The Higher Education Act recognizes this by allowing considerable latitude to institutions in designing non-traditional programs, including distance education programs. But what happens now that Cyber University has entered the scene?

Cyber U is an institution without a campus and without a standing faculty. Suppose this institution is delivering a self-paced, competency-based degree program in which students have little or no face-to-face interaction with other students or instructors. These circumstances challenge most traditional notions about a quality postsecondary education. In what sense is Cyber U offering what we consider a college education? Is it really necessary to have a faculty? If so, should that faculty be full-time or part-time, in residence or dispersed throughout the world? Who develops the curriculum? Who defines the competencies and assesses student learning? Or, if we are really judging the quality of programs by the learning outcomes of students, should other factors such as whether Cyber U has a campus, or how instruction is provided, matter? All these questions demand that all in the postsecondary education community rethink some of our basic, older assumptions.

Moreover, since the Internet recognizes no national or even international boundaries, and educational delivery therefore will not be limited to state or even regional boundaries, consumer protection is likely to emerge as a new federal issue.

In the past, accreditation relied primarily on institutional inputs (such as faculty credentials and library holdings) and processes (such as on-going institutional planning) to evaluate quality. Recently, accrediting agencies have begun to include student outcomes (such as graduation rates) as a measure of the quality of the education the institution offers. In the digital age and with the increasing number of non-traditional and for-profit institutions, evaluating student outcomes, particularly learning outcomes, must become more central to the accrediting process. Learning, after all, is where our focus should be, yet few institutions have any comprehensive program in place to examine their effectiveness in terms of what students actually learn. But how do we evaluate the worth of being on a campus, in a classroom, in face-to-face encounters with faculty and peers? We shouldn't discount the value of these experiences simply because we cannot measure them with accuracy.

Meeting the challenge of reorienting how we evaluate quality from proxy measures such as inputs and processes to student learning outcomes must be a shared responsibility of all sectors of higher education, the public and the private, the non-profit and the for-profit, the corporate and entrepreneurial. And, of course, accrediting agencies must play a principal role. Many accrediting agencies have been seriously examining their standards and processes to make sure they will meet the challenges the emerging postsecondary education market poses to evaluating quality. OPE applauds these efforts, and at the same time raises the question of whether or not the changes they are making will actually place student learning outcomes at the center of the evaluation process.

We embrace technology for the opportunities it provides to enrich higher education and extend its reach into areas we have yet to envision. Along with the opportunities, we must also meet the challenges that it poses to access, to accountability, and to quality assurance.

Responding to these challenges must be a shared responsibility. The public and the private sectors, non-profit and for-profit institutions, corporate and entrepreneurial entities, all must work individually and in partnership to make lifetime learning a reality for all Americans.

New Initiatives

Under the leadership of President Clinton and Vice President Gore, new initiatives have been developed to connect the nation's elementary and secondary classrooms to the Internet, to increase access to modern computers for teachers and students, and to help teachers integrate the use of these new tools in their classrooms. These new programs are unprecedented in scope and level of funding. In postsecondary education, too, the Clinton-Gore administration has demonstrated strong leadership in its educational technology initiatives.

The cost of postsecondary education is, of course, an important access issue for students. In this context, an important new student financial aid initiative is the Distance Education Demonstration Program, authorized by the Higher Education Amendments of 1998. Currently, the law and regulations governing Title IV student aid limit the amount of distance education an institution of higher education may offer while still retaining its eligibility to participate in the Title IV programs. Student aid requirements relating to educational program length can also be difficult to apply in programs that are self-paced or offered in time units that differ from standard semesters or quarters.

The Distance Education Demonstration Program allows the U.S. Secretary of Education to waive certain Title IV requirements. This allows distance education providers to experiment with potential alternatives to statutory and regulatory financial aid requirements that are too restrictive. The goal is to minimize any negative impact existing regulations might have on the development of distance learning, and at the same time maintain the integrity of student aid programs.

The Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE), well known for the innovative technology projects supported in its Comprehensive Program, is now administering another of the Department's new initiatives, the Learning Anytime Anywhere Partnerships (LAAP). The LAAP program provides grants to partnerships among colleges and universities, technology companies, employers, professional associations, and other organizations to develop asynchronous, online distance education programs—including those that are delivered in self-paced, competency-based formats.

LAAP partnerships seek to promote cooperation and resource sharing instead of unnecessary competition. They seek to create economies of scale to offset the

tremendous capital investments necessary for the development of quality multimedia instructional materials. They seek to address students' needs for online support services and new interactive pedagogies. They also address the needs of under-served groups. The LAAP program is a prime example of how the Department seeks to stimulate lifetime learning by fostering new partnerships.

This is a time of transition, and most of the territory we are looking at in distance education is uncharted. In large part, that is why OPE sought input from our stakeholders.

WHAT WE HEARD FROM STAKEHOLDERS—NATIONAL AGENDA OPPORTUNITIES

The listening sessions we conducted around the country provided ample evidence of the importance of technology and its uses both for on-campus and distance education courses, but also documented challenges. These included:

1. Technological change raises a wide range of policy issues and challenges that face policymakers, educators, and administrators at all levels. Policymakers at the federal and state levels of government must work actively with institutions, other postsecondary education providers, and accrediting agencies to address these challenges.

2. Distance education especially raises new challenges in the area of quality assurance. Both regulators and consumers need new ways to judge the quality of distance education offerings.

3. OPE should continue to encourage accreditors to develop outcome assessment techniques for learning in the classroom as well as out of it.

4. Title IV Student Financial Assistance Program requirements limit financial aid to distance education students. These rules need to be revised in order to expand access to distance education while still protecting the taxpayer investment in financial aid.

5. Technology offers new opportunities to use distance education and exchanges to improve international education and research.

6. Many institutions lack the resources to develop their technical capability and fully exploit the potential of new technology. Colleges and universities that serve minorities, low-income students, and first-generation college students need financial resources to develop technological infrastructure and expertise.

7. Technology has the potential to promote access, meet new needs for education and training, and improve quality. Promising technological approaches to these issues need more national support.

OPE ACTIONS

Clearly, the impetus for technology development in higher education and the expansion of distance education are present in both the higher education community and other entities interested in using technology to develop new kinds of institutions and services. It is very important for OPE to track trends in these areas and, where appropriate, to participate in discussions about these developments, particularly those relating to the quality and integrity of such efforts.

The U.S. Department of Education has a leadership role in policy matters with respect to the growth of distance education and technology. As a participant in one of the listening sessions phrased it, "The Department of Education has an important role in determining the parameters that will govern the directions distance education will take in the United States." Just as technology poses challenges to the higher education community to adopt new approaches to quality assurance, it challenges us to provide policy leadership that will result in more enlightened regulation of student aid that recognizes the legitimacy of the growing diversity in types of institutions and methods of delivering education.

In that context, OPE should consider the following steps:

1. OPE should develop proposals for changes to those Title IV Student Financial Assistance Program requirements that now limit student financial assistance to distance education students.

2. OPE should convene discussions of policy matters at the federal and state levels of government with institutions, other postsecondary education providers, and accrediting agencies.

3. OPE should initiate discussions related to expanding opportunities for distance education and exchanges using technology internationally.

4. OPE should encourage approaches to quality assurance in distance education that include a strong focus on outcomes and competencies as measures of quality.

5. OPE should provide information that will assist consumers in locating providers that offer distance education courses and programs that meet standards of acceptable quality.

6. OPE should use program resources to assist institutions in developing technical capability.

7. OPE should support experimentation with promising new models of educational practice that promote access, meet new needs for education and training, and improve quality.

8. OPE should collect and disseminate best practices utilizing a variety of methods. These should include written materials, but should expand to include networks that allow practitioners to engage in discussions online, and at meetings and conferences.

Theme 5

REVITALIZING INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

America is both the most global and the least global nation in the world. We have a problem that no one else has: we can pretend the rest of the world doesn't exist.

OPE *Agenda Project* Dialogue Session Participant

In almost every sector of American life, business, politics, entertainment, sports, and the arts, it is clear we operate in a global context. As IBM CEO Lou Gerstner said at Finance Conference 2000, "We have an exceptionally clear line of sight to a shift that has moved large portions of our economy from a physical to a digital basis, and given rise to the first truly global marketplace of goods, services and ideas." It is less clear as to whether our postsecondary education community is responding fully to the challenges of the new global marketplace.

It shouldn't take another Sputnik launch and a Cold War to galvanize our nation into action on international education. The launch of the Internet and global competition should be enough. In prior years, it was possible to avoid, for example, language studies with impunity. No longer. The Clinton-Gore administration knows this.

President Clinton, in his April 19, 2000, international education executive memorandum (**http://www.ed.gov/PressReleases/04-2000/wh-000419.html**), identified the challenges our country and our education community face: **"To continue to compete successfully in the global economy and to maintain our role as a world leader, the United States needs to ensure that its citizens develop a broad understanding of the world, proficiency in other languages, and knowledge of other cultures."**

Some institutions are working at developing such broad understanding of the world. But it does take some work. Many students who have just adjusted to life on campus are often reluctant to take on the challenge of living abroad. Nonetheless, Michigan State University sends approximately 20 percent of its students abroad to study. Most other schools that size send barely 1 percent. The California State University System now sends 2,000 students abroad each year with plans to increase that number to 6,000. Yet, it may be less costly for an American student to study abroad than in the United States.

In American postsecondary education, universal quality education requires intensive attention to international cultures, languages, economies, and political systems. International education for postsecondary students occurs not only through study abroad and exchanges but also through on-campus curricular components, non-curricular activities, and the campus presence of students from diverse countries and cultures.

More than 129,000 American postsecondary students received credit for study abroad last year. Recent trends have been encouraging. The strength of the American economy and the globalization of economies and employment are leading greater numbers of U.S.

students to complete a portion of their academic programs overseas. Moreover, **over 500,000 international students reside in the United States each year. They have not only an important cultural impact on U.S. campuses and surrounding communities, but also an important financial impact, contributing over $12 billion to the U.S. economy annually.**[57] But we are losing our share of these students to other nations that also see value in welcoming students from abroad.

The Office of Postsecondary Education (OPE) has played a significant role in the internationalization of American college and university campuses and in the stimulation of international exchanges. OPE's International Education and Foreign Language Studies (IEFLS) domestic programs, funded through Title VI of the Higher Education Act (HEA), have been critically important for the development of the U.S. higher education infrastructure. This infrastructure produces our nation's international expertise, the dissemination of international knowledge to policymakers and citizens, and the training of students for informed and responsible work, life, and citizenship in global economies.

The American postsecondary institutions with Title VI-supported National Resource Centers constitute less than three percent of all colleges and universities offering language instruction in the United States. Yet they account for 21 percent of undergraduate and 55 percent of graduate student enrollments in the less commonly taught languages (e.g., Swahili, Korean, Indonesian, Serbo-Croatian, Turkish).[58]

Moreover, Title VI funding for the 28 Centers for International Business Education in FY 1999 ($8 million) leveraged institutional and private sector funding more than three times the level of the federal investment. These centers have helped to internationalize American business schools and their curricula, as CEOs have long espoused, by enhancing the international components of disciplined-based courses, supporting foreign study and research for students and faculty, providing seminars for business executives and other postsecondary institutions, and facilitating U.S. visits by foreign education and business leaders.

The Fulbright-Hays overseas programs administered by OPE complement the Title VI programs by providing K-12 teachers, college students, doctoral degree candidates, and college faculty overseas opportunities for curriculum development, research, and academic training. These programs support the development of American international expertise in world areas and foreign languages important both for our nation and other nations. In addition, the Institute for International Public Policy (IIPP) supports consortia of Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs), Hispanic-Serving Institutions (HSIs), Tribally Controlled Colleges and Universities (TCCUs), other minority-serving institutions, and institutions that train foreign service professionals. This work increases the number of minorities in private international voluntary organizations, the U.S. Foreign Service, and related international positions.

The Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE), another OPE program, jointly funds multi-institution, multi-country postsecondary education curriculum development and exchange consortia with the European Community, with

Canada and Mexico, and with Brazil. External evaluations of these programs show that they have internationalized academic programs both in the U.S. and abroad through the production and dissemination of curricula in professional fields that successfully cross national, disciplinary, and language boundaries, including business and management, engineering, environmental sciences, and health sciences.

To cite one example, FIPSE's Program for North American Mobility in Higher Education is currently funding various programs involving institutions and students from the U.S., Canada, and Mexico. **One project is examining sustainable water resource management, another is focusing on legal issues in the wake of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), and others are preparing students for high demand technical jobs.**

In spite of these successful efforts and those of numerous other postsecondary education institutions, many American citizens and postsecondary institutions have drawn a sharp line between "international" education and "regular" programs of study. Many citizens and institutions continue to regard study abroad, on-campus international courses, inter-institutional postsecondary consortia, and similar efforts to be "frills" and "add-ons."

This view has produced American postsecondary education students and graduates who lack an appreciation for (and often even an interest in) foreign cultures, languages, perspectives, and problems. As one OPE *Agenda Project* dialogue participant remarked, "America is both the most global and the least global nation in the world. We have a problem that no one else has: we can pretend the rest of the world doesn't exist."

Indeed, a closer look indicates that American postsecondary education today is not as well positioned with respect to international education as suggested above. For example, **the number of international students studying each year in the United States is approximately five times the number of American students studying abroad, and less than one percent of U.S. students enrolled in postsecondary education each year study abroad.** Moreover, less than 10 percent of the American students studying abroad do so for longer than a semester.[59]

Part of the problem may be that institutions and students overestimate the cost of studying abroad. But some institutions have found that sending students abroad for a year actually costs less than teaching them at their home campuses here in the United States. The Institute for International Education recently commissioned Arthur Anderson to study whether U.S. colleges and universities are keeping their books in a way that accurately reflects the costs of educating a student on campus as compared to overseas. If the study reveals what the Institute expects it to—that sending students abroad is a relative bargain—it should support efforts to strengthen international education.

At the same time, the flow of international students to American postsecondary institutions is increasingly threatened as other countries mount vigorous recruitment campaigns to compete for international students. Also, certain Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) visa issuance regulations decrease the number of

international students studying in the U.S. Improved training for consular officers regarding U.S. educational practices could help address this problem.

As a result of these developments, since 1982, the U.S. share of international students studying outside their own countries has shrunk from 40 percent to 30 percent.[60] Similar problems face our nation in terms of building international expertise: **American postsecondary institutions are not graduating sufficient numbers of students with foreign language and culture expertise to meet the needs of business, government, and universities.**

WHAT WE HEARD FROM STAKEHOLDERS

Participants in the *Agenda Project* dialogue sessions articulated often and persuasively the many serious international education challenges that American postsecondary education faces. They recognize that an excellent foundation for the internationalization of postsecondary education institutions, curricula, faculty, and students exists. Yet they acknowledge that international education has received inadequate attention and resources in our nation's colleges and universities, our K-12 schools, our state governments, our federal government, and our businesses. They also recognize that we are only one part of a larger world and that the increasingly universal American postsecondary education system, with its diversity of learners, providers, locations, outcomes, credentials, and funders, is integrally interconnected with this world.

NATIONAL AGENDA OPPORTUNITIES

The primary challenges that the *Agenda Project* dialogue participants identified include:

1. In American postsecondary education, international education generally is separated from other disciplines, from teacher education and other graduate and professional programs, and from the core elements of the undergraduate arts and sciences curricula. In today's global environment, international education must be more thoroughly integrated throughout the postsecondary curricula.

2. The lack of systematic attention to international education in many postsecondary institutions and the scarcity of effective K-16 partnerships have fostered a similar lack of attention to international education in grades K-12. Students must begin preparing for the global economy at the earliest levels.

3. Support by government, postsecondary institutions, and the private sector for the production and dissemination of international expertise and research is limited and piecemeal. At the state and national levels, there is a general lack of effective international education and policy advocacy by, and collaboration among, the many institutions and organizations that have a stake in postsecondary education.

4. Many factors discourage U.S. undergraduate and graduate student education and research abroad. These factors include state government postsecondary education

program and funding policies, postsecondary institutions' curricula and degree requirements, faculty expectations for timely student progression, and uncertain employment and career benefits from international study.

5. The United States is faced with increasing competition in educating students from other countries. They are mounting vigorous recruitment campaigns to compete for international students. The visa issue might be contributing to this problem and requires further study.

6. U.S. and foreign student opportunities for study abroad often fail to meet the needs of diverse student learners (for example, part-time students, racial and ethnic minorities, disabled students) and to recognize the benefits of participation by a more diverse group of institutions (for example, U.S. community colleges, for-profit institutions).

7. Unnecessary government regulatory and procedural barriers discourage international students from studying in the United States, U.S. students from studying abroad, and institutions worldwide from providing quality education opportunities for American students both in the U.S. and abroad.

8. There is a lack of knowledge about OPE international education "lessons learned" and "best practices" in other OPE programs, in other U.S. Department of Education offices, in other Executive Branch departments, in states, and among postsecondary education institutions.

These challenges require that OPE articulate and implement, working collaboratively with the postsecondary education community, a strategic vision. That vision should encompass critically important international education goals for American postsecondary education, including: to produce and use U.S. international experts and research to meet national strategic needs; to increase and strengthen postsecondary education linkages with K-12 education systems, business, media, state and local governments, and other sectors; and to educate foreign nationals in diverse U.S. postsecondary education institutions to foster these individuals' better understanding of American systems and institutions.

OPE ACTIONS

OPE, in partnership with postsecondary education institutions and associations, federal and state government departments and agencies, and business and other nongovernmental organizations, has opportunities to achieve these international education goals. The following OPE strategies for achieving these goals address the ten core areas outlined in President Clinton's April 19, 2000, executive memorandum on international education policy (**http://www.ed.gov/PressReleases/04-2000/wh-000419.html**). These core areas also are being addressed by the Departments of State and Education in their collaborative strategy for the implementation of the executive memorandum. See http://www.ed.gov/offices/OUS/PES/discussion_paper.html.

1. OPE should support the increased internationalization of U.S. campuses and undergraduate programs.

2. OPE should support the development of models of curriculum integration, language learning, and student mobility that foster cross-national institutional consortia and partnerships as well as the dissemination of materials and practices they develop.

3. OPE should support international education programs and studies that increase (even double) the number and diversity of students who study and intern abroad; encourage students and institutions to explore non-traditional study abroad opportunities; remove barriers for studying abroad relating to the recognition, transfer, and portability of academic credit and qualifications; and expand awareness that study abroad need not be any more costly than study at U.S. institutions.

4. OPE should support strengthened foreign language learning at all education levels, including the achievement of literacy in at least two languages and teacher preparation and professional development.

5. OPE should support partnerships with K-12 schools, businesses, governments, and other organizations as well as clearinghouses and Web sites for identifying available expertise and national needs.

6. OPE should support increased postsecondary education study in the U. S. by qualified students from overseas by improving the availability of information and advice about such opportunities and removing policy and procedural barriers that limit the international flow of students, especially the granting of INS visas to international students.

7. OPE should support enhanced coordination of international education programs within OPE; across the U.S. Department of Education; and among executive branch departments and agencies, international organizations, and education ministries of other nations, in collaboration with the U.S. Department of State.

CONCLUSION AND SUMMARY

Core Values at the Turning Point

This is a time of awe-inspiring change in postsecondary education, just as it is for the rest of the world. But core values don't change; the means to achieve them might, but the values themselves do not. As a nation, we value education and have since colonial times. Since those times, we have made great progress toward enabling all of our citizens to achieve the American Dream. Education has been the key. Yet, there's more to be done.

All Americans deserve a chance at the economic opportunity, cultural enrichment, and civic engagement that result from higher education. By building upon our investment in education, we can ensure the future prosperity of our nation**. Robert Hutchins, the great educator and former president of the University of Chicago, once wrote, "The object of education is to prepare the young to educate themselves throughout their lives."** In the information age, that is true now more than ever.

Each generation faces its own challenges. In the Education Era the challenge is to educate a broader mix of people to be our next generation of leaders and to prepare all Americans to succeed in the competitive global economy of the 21st century. More importantly**,** we must educate the next generation of students to be capable, responsible citizens who give something back to their community, the country, and the world.

To succeed at this daunting challenge, we must constantly measure our progress, especially in this digital age of rapid change. It is not a simple task, but it begins with a simple step. We asked. We went across the country and asked our stakeholders, "How are we doing?" We asked, "What should we be doing differently?" We received many thoughtful answers; they're detailed in this report.

Based on what we heard, we have set out twelve strategies, and thirty-eight specific action items for OPE. In total, they outline a new path for OPE. The principles that guide us along that path are solid and set in stone. We seek to establish access to a quality education for all Americans. We are determined to accurately assess the money spent to achieve that goal. Yet the means to achieve the goals are not set in stone. More likely they are written on a personal digital assistant, because today and in the future we must be responsive to the changing needs of lifetime learners. We must be flexible. A rigid bureaucracy serves no one.

At OPE we will remain flexible. We will keep asking questions and we will keep listening. The primary goal of this report is to make sure the dialogue continues and changes are made. We must all squarely face the tough questions of access, financing, accountability, technology, teacher quality, and globalization. It is clear our universe is changing rapidly. It is equally clear we have the assets to adapt to the change. Working together, we can make a quality, cost-effective, postsecondary education a reality for all Americans.

TWELVE OPE STRATEGIES FOR THE NEW ENVIRONMENT

1. Providing Leadership at the Turning Point

What became clear through the *Agenda Project* process is that many factors point to an enhanced role for OPE—not in terms of money or control, but mainly in terms of leadership and advocacy. *Agenda Project* participants described a changing, growing postsecondary education system, one difficult to fathom, let alone navigate. OPE should serve its stakeholders as a doorway to new ideas, partnerships, and practices. OPE should expand its work as a think tank for good ideas, analysis, and research in postsecondary education, especially in the access and financing areas. For example, through in-house analysis, contracted research, competitive grants, staffing to commissions and study groups, and development of policy papers and legislation, OPE should play a major role in revamping our financial aid system.

2. Building Financial Power for Institutions and Students

The U.S. Department of Education uses two tools to expand opportunity and enhance quality in postsecondary education: grants to postsecondary institutions and financial aid to students. Many of our grant programs have proven highly successful at helping students; improving teaching; promoting innovation and technology in education; strengthening international education; and promoting access through institutional development and support. We need to strengthen these existing programs

3. Examining the Roles and Responsibilities in Paying for College

The Department of Education should lead a dialogue on how to pay for college. College presidents, leaders in national and state governments, students, economists, and business and community leaders should discuss how all the partners should share in helping to make college accessible for Americans from all groups. This should be a big picture look ahead to provide a road map for change in the next decade.

Questions to be addressed should include: How much should postsecondary education cost? What prices should students and parents pay? Should there be free public education? How much should states and the federal government pay? What is the role for private sources? What is the mix of aid—how do institutional subsidies, grants to students, loans, and tax policy interact? What is the appropriate balance among different sources of aid? How do all these questions and answers vary for different groups of students?

4. Becoming a Gateway to the Federal Government

Federal government agencies—from the National Institutes of Health, to the Department of Energy, to the Department of Defense—operate many programs that support higher education. Identifying these programs, though, can be a problem for those they are

designed to benefit. OPE must become a better gateway to the federal government for America's postsecondary education community. As part of this effort, OPE has published on the Web a Directory of Federal Programs for Postsecondary Education. The Directory is a comprehensive, single source of information on all federal programs on or relating to postsecondary education offered by all federal departments and agencies. The Directory includes all federal programs of benefit to colleges and universities managed by a variety of departments and agencies, including the Department of Education. It can be accessed at **http://www.ed.gov/offices/ope/directory/**.

5. Expanding Resources for All Institutions

The Department plays a critical role in helping institutions expand resources. Several of OPE's established programs address this issue; our Strengthening Institutions, Developing Hispanic-Serving Institutions (HSIs), and Strengthening Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) programs have been indispensable in building up institutions that serve low-income and minority students. We should expand such programs.

6. Dancing to the Same Tune

OPE administers over 40 grant programs that address challenges facing postsecondary education today. Ensuring that these programs run effectively and efficiently is a critical step to help institutions meet these challenges. Many participants in our *Agenda Project* dialogue sessions pointed out ways that OPE can improve service to its customers—from standardizing application procedures, to reengineering grant processes, to using more meaningful statistical measures in our programs. We should also improve collaboration among OPE programs to take advantage of potential synergies, and avoid duplication of work. We should move to the point where all are grant applications are on the Web.

7. Watching Public Dollars and Measuring Outcomes

Across the country, taxpayers and their representatives rightfully demand accountability for public dollars spent. In the digital age of rapid change, the process is more difficult but no less important. Funds must be accounted for and outcomes measured. With respect to those principles, OPE will remain stubbornly old-fashioned—but the means by which we measure outcomes may have to change. We regulate distribution of billions of dollars in Title IV funds and rely on measurements that have been called into question in the information age. It is up to the entire postsecondary education community to reassess this situation and devise outcome assessments more suited to today's education environment.

8. Recreating Regulatory Reform

The first multipurpose computer, ENIAC, developed at the University of Pennsylvania in 1946, was a breakthrough idea at the time. But no one would think of using it today. Yet, that is almost what we are doing when it comes to regulatory reform in

postsecondary education. The system, its facts, beliefs, and attitudes, were developed in the 1950s. New distance learning providers are espousing new standards based on outcomes. There have been some change and progress, but not enough to deal with the changing technology and number of students the system must deal with today. How do we measure outcomes in the digital age? OPE should lead the way in reforming the system to bring it up to date.

9. Building New Partnerships

One of the clearest messages we received in our *Agenda Project* dialogue sessions was that postsecondary institutions and the Office of Postsecondary Education cannot meet the challenges we face today alone. Many of these challenges relate not only to our education system but also to our entire society; businesses, community organizations, local governments, and, in fact, every institution in society need to work in partnership to address them. The Department of Education has an important role in bringing these diverse constituencies together to build these partnerships.

10. Creating a New Best Practices and Research Web Site

What is working, and what isn't, in postsecondary education? What is the economic value of postsecondary education? What kinds of skills do employers value in potential hires? What will America's student body look like in 5 years? 15 years? What will postsecondary institutions need to do to accommodate this changing student body?

Answers to many of these questions are available—in universities, think tanks, government agencies, and particularly in the Department of Education's Office of Educational Research and Improvement. Yet many educators don't know where to go to find such research and "best practices." In our dialogue sessions we discovered that many look to OPE to provide them. A new Web site would be very helpful.

11. Launching a Web Site Regarding Quality Distance Learning

As Secretary Riley testified before the Web Based Education Commission on 2 February 2000, "Here is, in my mind, one of the thorniest problems of the Web—ensuring that the quality of what is retrieved is high—or, at the very least, ensuring that users have the intellectual capacity to discern when it is not. No one expects that a medium as free and unchecked as the Web can be completely monitored or, for that matter, be of completely high quality. But we can work to ensure that students and others will know how to make well-grounded intellectual choices when they use the Internet for education."

To do that we should provide information that will assist consumers in locating providers that offer distance education courses and programs that meet standards of acceptable quality.

12. Sponsoring a Competition to Create 21st Century Teaching Academies

OPE, with appropriate public and private sector partners, should consider sponsoring a grant competition to encourage states, or regional partnerships, to build upon some of the creative ideas that are being tried to improve teacher training, for example, the teacher training program created by the Open University in the United Kingdom, and the Cornell University Master of Arts in Teaching program, and other ideas.

THIRTY-EIGHT OPE ACTIONS

Access: Ensuring All Students Are Prepared to Go to College and Succeed

1. OPE should increase its emphasis on K-16 programs (such as GEAR UP and TRIO) that encourage students to think early about college, take the right classes, and begin financial planning. Through partnerships at the local level and partnerships with foundations and businesses we can leverage federal dollars much more effectively. The more these partnerships focus on systemic change, the greater the effect.

2. OPE should consider initiatives that bring technology more quickly and pervasively to postsecondary institutions that serve underserved populations, perhaps through our Institutional Development programs.

3. OPE should pay far more attention to graduate education and international education than it has in the past.

4. OPE should advocate for research on the value of software and technology based learning for postsecondary students with disabilities, in particular for students with learning disabilities.

5. OPE should work with accreditation bodies and federal entities with governance authority regarding the ADA and the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

6. OPE should convene meetings with leaders in postsecondary schools who are knowledgeable about students with disabilities and can make recommendations regarding a seamless K-16 system for students.

Access: Examining the Roles and Responsibilities in Paying for College

(see also Twelve Strategies for the New Environment)

7. The U.S. Department of Education should lead a dialogue on how to pay for college. College presidents, leaders in national and state governments, students, economists, and business and community leaders should discuss how all the partners could share in helping to make college accessible for Americans from all groups. This examination and analysis should provide a road map for change in the next decade.

   Questions to be addressed should include: Should there be options for free public postsecondary education? If not, what should students and parents pay? How much should states and the federal government pay? What are the likely financial resources to be available to states and the federal government? How does this interact with expected demand, including increased demand from groups who are

likely to be less well prepared? What is the role for private sources? What is the mix of aid—how do institutional subsidies, grants to students, loans, and tax policy interact? What is the appropriate balance among different sources of aid? How do all these questions and answers vary for different groups of students? What are the intergenerational issues—how do different options affect different generations? Are these the appropriate ways to transfer benefits across generations?

8. OPE should create a study group to examine the student aid system and the need analysis system. Its charge would be to design a simplified, easy-to-understand system that reflects the realities of today's education and students and is flexible to meet tomorrow's needs.

   This group would look at more detailed and more technical issues than the first group. Simplification would be the overriding goal: easier and earlier determination of need and aid eligibility. A simplified need analysis system—fewer variables, less open to gaming and unintended consequences, easier to understand and file, earlier application dates so students would know their eligibility earlier, adjustments for new modes of educational delivery and new types of students, and new sources of aid, such as tax credits—would be the goal here.

   The system for delivering aid should also be examined, particularly the design and delivery of loans. The existence of two major loan programs since 1993—Direct Student loans and FFEL—has benefited students by providing them better benefits and service and reduced federal costs. We are at a crossroads, however, where a careful examination and analysis is needed on the future delivery of student loans. Income-contingent repayment (ICR) and the specific formula being used also need reexamination.

9. The Department of Education should mount a major public information campaign with its partners to ensure that all Americans know what college opportunities are available, how much they cost, and what aid is available to meet the costs.

   Despite the fact that much information is already available to students and families, many Americans are quite uninformed or have misconceptions about the true opportunities. The need for more public awareness to ensure that families know the real facts about college prices and student financial aid was raised many times in *Agenda Project* sessions. This information needs to be broadly available, especially to more at-risk students in the middle school years when they are making key choices about what classes to take, decisions that will affect their chances of college success in future years.

10. OPE should examine the role of student loans in helping families to pay for college and the effects of debt burden on students' decisions about whether and where to go on to postsecondary education, and on their choices after leaving

school regarding careers and graduate education. This effort should examine the effectiveness of different repayment options, including income-contingent repayment, and other alternatives, such as loan forgiveness. Possible options for changes in the next reauthorization of the Higher Education Act should be considered.

11. OPE should undertake a major effort to encourage lifelong learning, including an examination of what is occurring now and what the barriers are to more lifelong learning. This effort should look at administrative, regulatory, and statutory barriers.

12. OPE, together with its partners in postsecondary education and industry, should mount a major effort to examine the complex requirements now surrounding the student aid programs. The effort should examine ways to reduce requirements and increase flexibility to deal with new student demands and technologies while continuing to ensure accountability for taxpayer dollars. This effort should look at administrative, regulatory, and statutory barriers, including recommendations for the next reauthorization.

Improving Teacher Quality

(see also Twelve Strategies for the New Environment)

13. OPE should support partnerships among K-12 schools and postsecondary institutions to create comprehensive change in education.

14. OPE should work with states to find ways for mid-career professionals to prepare for and enter teaching more easily, while maintaining and raising certification standards.

15. OPE should encourage higher education leaders to get involved in teacher preparation reform: the data on subject matter competence of new teachers and student performance on tests with rigorous standards show that the entire university must be behind quality teacher training.

16. OPE should work with national organizations and other institutions to facilitate closer integration of teacher colleges with the entire university.

17. OPE should gather and disseminate up-to-date information about innovative teacher preparation practices; many institutions have tackled aspects of the quality-teaching puzzle and their work should be identified and publicized widely.

18. OPE should convene forums on teacher quality issues at state and regional levels: higher visibility for the core issues of teacher quality will draw state and other leaders into the reform process.

19. OPE should develop a broad strategy to attract students into teaching, especially minority students: these students often have strong ties to their community and want to practice their professions in the places where they grew up.

20. OPE should provide effective outreach about funding opportunities in OPE, and technical assistance for institutions with limited grant-seeking experience.

21. OPE should involve foundations, businesses, states, universities, and other partners in carefully designed efforts to fund comprehensive approaches to teacher quality improvement: federal leadership can bring other important partners to the table and accelerate the pace of change.

22. OPE should promote the effective integration of technology into curriculum and instructional practices on the university campus and in the school classroom.

23. OPE should consider a grant competition to encourage states, or regional partnerships, to build on some of the creative ideas that are being tried to improve teacher training. Whatever the final form, one goal of the program would be to break down the current barriers that separate the main postsecondary institution from the college of education.

Integrating Technology and Distance Education into the Curriculum

(see also Twelve Strategies for the New Environment)

24. OPE should discuss with the community proposals for changes to those Title IV Student Financial Assistance Program requirements that now limit student financial assistance to distance education students.

25. OPE should convene discussions of policy matters at the federal and state levels of government with institutions, other postsecondary education providers, and accrediting agencies.

26. OPE should initiate discussions related to expanding opportunities for distance education and exchanges using technology internationally.

27. OPE should encourage approaches to quality assurance in distance education that include a strong focus on outcomes and competencies.

28. OPE should provide information that will assist consumers in locating providers that offer distance education courses and programs that meet standards of acceptable quality.

29. OPE should use program resources to assist institutions in developing technical capability.

30. OPE should support experimentation with promising new models of educational practice that promote access, meet new needs for education and training, and improve quality.

31. OPE should collect and disseminate best practices utilizing a variety of methods. These should include written materials, but should expand to include networks that allow practitioners to engage in discussions online, and at meetings and conferences.

Revitalizing International Education

32. OPE should support the increased internationalization of U.S. campuses and undergraduate programs.

33. OPE should support the development of models of curriculum integration, language learning, and student mobility that foster cross-national institutional consortia and partnerships; and the dissemination of materials and practices they develop.

34. OPE should support improved access to international education programs that increase the number and diversity of students who study and intern abroad; encourage students and institutions to explore non-traditional study abroad opportunities; and remove barriers for studying abroad relating to the recognition, transfer, and portability of academic credit and qualifications.

35. OPE should support strengthened foreign language learning at all education levels, including the achievement of literacy in at least two languages; and teacher preparation and professional development.

36. OPE should support partnerships with K-12 schools, businesses, governments, and other organizations; and clearinghouses and Web sites for identifying available expertise and national needs.

37. OPE should support increased postsecondary study in the U.S. by qualified students from overseas by improving the availability of information about such opportunities; and removing policy and procedural barriers that limit the international flow of students.

38. OPE should support enhanced coordination of international education programs within OPE; across the U.S. Department of Education; and among executive branch departments and agencies, international organizations, and education ministries of other nations, in collaboration with the U.S. Department of State.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Agenda Project Meetings

JANUARY

1. **Teacher Quality Project Directors Meeting**
   January 21, 2000
   Crystal City, VA

2. **Training Session for Accrediting Associations**
   January 24, 2000
   Washington, DC

3. **Higher Education Council for Special Education**
   January 28, 2000
   Washington, DC

4. **Council for Christian Colleges and Universities Presidents' Meeting**
   January 31, 2000
   Washington, DC

FEBRUARY

5. **National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities**
   February 3, 2000
   Washington, DC

6. **Tribal Colleges**
   February 10, 2000
   Washington, DC

7. **National Association of Graduate and Professional Students**
   February 11, 2000
   Washington, DC

8. **Association of Teacher Educators**
   February 14, 2000
   Orlando, FL

9. **Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education Board Meeting**
   February 24, 2000
   Washington, DC

10. **National Education Association**
    February 24, 2000
    Washington, DC

11. **Arizona Business Executives**
    February 28, 2000
    Phoenix, AZ

12. **Arizona Academic Administrators**
    February 28, 2000
    Phoenix, AZ

13. **Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education Reviewers**
    February, 29, 2000
    Greensboro, NC

14. **American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education**
    February 29, 2000
    Chicago, IL

15. **Texas College (HBCU's)**
    February 29, 2000
    Tyler, Texas

16. **Arizona State University West (Faculty)**
    February 29, 2000
    Phoenix, AZ

17. **Arizona State University West (Students)**
    February 29, 2000
    Phoenix, AZ

MARCH

18. **Florida International University**
    March 1, 2000
    Miami, FL

19. **Distance Education Demonstration Program**
    March 15-16, 2000
    Chicago, IL

20. **Program for North American Mobility in Higher Education Project Directors Meeting**
    March 16, 2000
    Austin, TX

21. National Committee on Foreign Medical Education Accreditation
March 17, 2000
Washington, DC

22. Child Care Grantee/Project Directors Meeting
March 20, 2000
Washington, DC

23. Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges
March 20, 2000
New Orleans, LA

24. Committee on Institutional Cooperation
March 20, 2000
Chicago, IL

25. American Council on Education
March 21, 2000
Chicago, IL

26. National Association of Student Personnel Administrators
March 21, 2000
Indianapolis, IN

27. Career College Association
March 23, 2000
Washington, DC

28. Skidmore College
March 23, 2000
Saratoga Springs, NY

29. National Alliance for Business
March 29, 2000
Washington, DC

30. Office of Postsecondary Education Staff
March 30, 2000
Washington, DC

APRIL

31. National Association of Graduate and Professional Students
April 1, 2000
Durham, NC

32. Council of Recognized National Accrediting Agencies
April 4, 2000
Washington, DC

33. TRIO Conference
April 5, 2000
Newport, RI

34. Boston Regional Meeting
April 5, 2000
Boston, MA

35. Associated New American College
April 8, 2000
Tacoma, WA

36. Students
April 10, 2000
Iowa

37. American Association of Community Colleges
April 10, 2000
Washington, DC

38. Southeastern University
April 11, 2000
Washington, DC

39. George Mason University
April 12, 2000
Fairfax, VA

40. United Faculty of Florida
April 14, 2000
Orlando, FL

41. Meeting of HSI Presidents
April 17, 2000
San Bernadino, CA

42. University of Alaska - Anchorage
April 17, 2000
Anchorage, AK

43. University of Alaska - Fairbanks

April 18, 2000
Fairbanks, AK

44. Denver Business Executives
April 18, 2000
Denver, CO

45. Meeting of Presidents of Public Colleges in Texas
April 19, 2000
Austin, TX

46. International Education Dialogue
April 19, 2000
Washington, DC

47. American Association of University Professors (Collective Bargaining Group)
April 21, 200
Washington, DC

48. University of Maine
April 25, 2000
Portland, ME

49. Dallas Regional Meeting
April 26, 2000
Dallas, TX

50. Columbia University, NYC Educators
April 26, 2000

New York, NY

51. Reed College
April 27, 2000
Portland, OR

MAY

52. San Francisco Regional Meeting
May 2, 2000
San Francisco, CA

53. Technology Dialogue
May 4, 2000
Washington, DC

54. United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization International Dialogue
May 4, 2000
Washington, DC

55. Distance Education Dialogue (Business Executives)
May 5, 2000
Washington, DC

56. Puerto Rican University Presidents and the Association of Private Schools
May 5, 2000
San Juan, Puerto Rico

57. National Center for Learning Disabilities (Hosted by the College Board)
May 8, 2000
New York City, NY

58. Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education
May 9, 2000
Denver, CO

59. Atlanta Regional Meeting
May 10, 2000
Atlanta, GA

60. Learning Disabilities Association
May 18, 2000
Washington, DC

61. NAFSA – Association of International Educators
May 30-June 2, 2000
San Diego, CA

62. American Council on Education
June 4, 2000
Salt Lake City, UT

63. Occidental College (faculty)
June 6, 2000
Los Angeles, CA

64. National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration
June 9, 2000
Washington, DC

65. United Negro College Fund
June 12, 2000
Austin, TX

66. United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization
June 22, 2000
Washington, DC

67. Chicago Education Alliance
June 28, 2000
Chicago, IL

Appendix B

Programs of the Office of Postsecondary Education—

PROGRAMS OF THE OFFICE OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION (OPE)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Dr. A. Lee Fritschler, *Assistant Secretary*
(202) 502-7750

Maureen A. McLaughlin,
Deputy Assistant Secretary for
Policy, Planning and Innovation

Claudio R. Prieto,
Deputy Assistant Secretary for
Higher Education Programs

Helping All Americans Reach Postsecondary Education

OPE's work supporting higher education begins before students even enroll at postsecondary institutions. Students – especially those who may become the first in their families to go on to higher education – need to start planning early for college and need information, encouragement and academic support as they prepare for higher education. Our GEAR UP initiative and several of our TRIO programs provide grants to support projects that meet these needs

Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs (GEAR UP)

Description: Promotes and supports community-based and state efforts to encourage more young people to have high expectations, stay in school, study hard and take the right courses to go to college. GEAR UP funding is allocated among grants to community-based partnerships and grants to states.
Potential Grantees: Partnerships among at least one higher education institution, at least one school district acting on behalf of one or more middle schools and high schools in low-income communities, and at least two additional organizations; state agencies designated by the Governor.
Funding: $200 million in Fiscal Year 2000
Average Award: $460,000 for Partnership Grants; $2 million for State Grants
Next Competition: Fiscal Year 2001 *Contact:* Ray Ramirez at (202) 502-7676 or gearup@ed.gov.

Talent Search

Description: Identifies and assists individuals from disadvantaged backgrounds who have the potential to succeed in higher education. Projects provide services such as counseling, tutoring and mentoring; help with admissions and financial aid applications; exposure to college campuses; and career exploration and aptitude assessment.
Potential Grantees: Institutions of higher education, public or private not-for-profit agencies, a combination of institutions, agencies, and organizations, and in exceptional cases, secondary schools
Funding: $100,507,000 in Fiscal Year 2000
Average Award: $279,000 for one year of a four-year grant

Next Competition: *Fiscal Year 2002* Contact: *Peggy Whitehead at (202) 502-7600 or OPE_TRIO@ed.gov*

Upward Bound

Description: Provides support to participants in their preparation for college entrance. Projects provide academic instruction and additional services like counseling, tutoring, mentoring, and help with college entrance and financial aid applications.
Potential Grantees: Institutions of higher education, public or private not-for-profit agencies, a combination of institutions, agencies, and organizations, and in exceptional cases, secondary schools
Funding: $240,805,000 in Fiscal Year 2000
Average Award: $311,000 for one year of a grant
Next Competition: Fiscal Year 2003 *Contact:* Peggy Whitehead at (202) 502-7600 or OPE_TRIO@ed.gov

Upward Bound Math and Science

Description: Funds specialized Upward Bound math and science centers to strengthen the math and science skills of participating students and encourage students to pursue degrees in these fields. Projects support math and science-oriented activities like intensive summer programs; counseling and advisement; exposure to university researchers; computer training; and participant-conducted, mentored research.
Potential Grantees: Institutions of higher education, public or private not-for-profit agencies, a combination of institutions, agencies, and organizations, and in exceptional cases, secondary schools
Funding: $30,155,000 in Fiscal Year 200
Average Award: $245,163 for one year of a grant
Next Competition: Fiscal Year 2003 *Contact:* Peggy Whitehead at (202) 502-7600 or OPE_TRIO@ed.gov

Educational Opportunity Centers

Description: Provides counseling and information on college admissions to qualified adults who want to enter or continue a program of postsecondary education. Projects provide services like counseling, tutoring and mentoring; help with admissions and financial aid applications; coordination with local higher education institutions; and career workshops.
Potential Grantees: Institutions of higher education, public or private not-for-profit agencies, a combination of institutions, agencies, and organizations, and in exceptional cases, secondary schools
Funding: $30,474,000 in Fiscal Year 2000
Average Award: $372,000 for one year of a grant
Next Competition: Fiscal Year 2002 *Contact:* Peggy Whitehead at (202) 502-7600 or OPE_TRIO@ed.gov

Training Program for Federal TRIO Programs Staff

Description: Provides training to enhance the skills and expertise of project directors and staff employed in the Federal TRIO programs. Topics for training include improving student retention; counseling services; student testing; working with specific TRIO populations; legislative and regulatory requirements; program evaluation; helping students obtain financial aid; design and operation of model TRIO projects; new director training; and use of appropriate educational technology.
Potential Grantees: Higher education institutions and public and private not-for-profit institutions or organizations
Funding: $5,677,000 in Fiscal Year 2000
Average Award: $237,000
Next Competition: FY 2002 *Contact:* Linda Bird-Johnson at (202) 502-7600 or OPE_TRIO@ed.gov

Improving Teaching at All Levels

Promoting quality instruction is essential to maintaining quality in postsecondary education, and postsecondary schools play an important role in training teachers at the elementary and secondary levels, too. Two new initiatives – our Teacher Quality programs and Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers to Use Technology – address teacher education. Several of our Fulbright-Hays international programs support quality instruction at postsecondary institutions by funding faculty research and educational experiences abroad.

Teacher Quality State Grants

Description: Helps states improve the quality of their teaching force through comprehensive changes in state policies and practices for teacher preparation, licensure, certification, and professional development.
Potential Grantees: State authorities responsible for teacher certification and preparation
Funding: $7.9 million in Fiscal Year 2000
Average Award: Approximately $1.4 million
Next Competition: Fiscal Year 2000 *Contact:* Ed Crowe at (202) 502-7878 or TeacherQuality@ed.gov

Teacher Quality Recruitment Grants

Description: Helps identify the critical needs of high-need local school districts for recruiting and preparing highly competent teachers; helps identify the pools of potential teachers who fit these needs and recruit from these pools; and helps design high-quality teacher preparation and induction programs tailored to the needs of the community and the teacher candidates.
Potential Grantees: States, and partnerships that include a teacher preparation institution, a school of arts and sciences, and a high-need local school district
Funding: $9.6 million in Fiscal Year 1999
Average Award: Approximately $343,000
Next Competition: N/A *Contact:* Ed Crowe at (202) 502-7878 or TeacherQuality@ed.gov

Teacher Quality Partnership Grants

Description: Supports partnerships to improve student learning by bringing about fundamental change and improvement in the way teachers are prepared for service in local high-need school districts.
Potential Grantees: Partnerships that include a higher education institution's teacher preparation program and its school of arts and science, together with a local high-need school district
Funding: $6.3 million in Fiscal Year 2000
Average Award: $1.32 million
Next Competition: Fiscal Year 2000 *Contact:* Ed Crowe at (202) 502-7878 or TeacherQuality@ed.gov

Demonstration Projects to Ensure Quality Higher Education for Students with Disabilities

Description: Supports demonstration projects that provide technical assistance and professional development activities for postsecondary faculty and administrators in order to provide students with disabilities a quality postsecondary education.
Potential Grantees: Higher education institutions
Funding: $5,000,000 in Fiscal Year 2000
Average Award: $290,000 (estimated)
Next Competition: Not yet scheduled *Contact:* Amie Amiot at (202) 502-7880; TTY: (202) 205-9277 or Amie_Amiot@ed.gov

Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers to Use Technology

Description: Helps future teachers become proficient in the use of modern learning technologies. The program addresses looming teacher shortages by developing well-qualified, technology-proficient teachers who are prepared to teach in 21st century schools, particularly schools in low-income communities or rural areas.

Potential Grantees: Consortia composed of higher education institutions, state agencies, school districts, nonprofit organizations, and other interested organizations
Funding: $75 million in Fiscal Year 2000
Average Award: $400,000
Next Competition: *Fiscal Year 2001* Contact: *Tom Carroll at (202) 502-7788 or Teacher_Technology@ed.gov*

Fulbright-Hays Training Grants – Faculty Research Abroad
Description: Provides grants to institutions of higher education to fund faculty to maintain and improve their area studies and language skills by conducting research abroad for periods of 3 to 12 months.
Potential Grantees: U.S. higher education institutions
Funding: $930,000 in Fiscal Year 2000
Average Award: $46,500 for fellowships
Next Competition: Fiscal Year 2001 *Contact*: Eliza Washington at (202) 502-7700 or Eliza_Washington@ed.gov

Fulbright-Hays Training Grants – Group Projects Abroad
Description: Provides grants to support overseas projects in training, research, and curriculum development in modern foreign languages and area studies for teachers, students, and faculty engaged in a common endeavor. Projects may include short-term seminars, curriculum development, group research or study, or advanced intensive language programs.
Potential Grantees: Higher education institutions, state education departments, nonprofit education organizations, and consortia
Funding: $2,361,010 in Fiscal Year 2000
Average Award: Approximately $63,811
Next Competition: Fiscal Year 2001 *Contact:* Lungching Chiao at (202) 502-7700 or Lungching_Chiao@ed.gov

Fulbright-Hays Seminars Abroad – Bilateral Projects
Description: Provides short-term study/travel seminars abroad for U.S. educators in the social sciences and humanities for the purpose of improving their understanding and knowledge of the peoples and cultures of other countries.
Potential Grantees: Higher education institutions
Funding: $1,135,000 in Fiscal Year 2000
Average Award: Approximately $160,000
Next Competition: Fiscal Year 2001 *Contact:* Lungching Chiao at (202) 502-7700 or Lungching_Chiao@ed.gov

Supporting Undergraduate Postsecondary Students

Once students are ready for postsecondary education, they may still need special services or support to stay in school and succeed. Several TRIO programs and the new Childcare Access Means Parents in School initiative provide some of these services. In addition, the Byrd Honors Scholarship program provides financial support for some exceptional students. (The U.S. Department of Education also provides substantial direct student aid for students under programs like the Pell Grant program and the Federal Direct Student Loan Program; the Office of Student Financial Assistance, not OPE, administers these programs, however, and information about them can be obtained by calling 1-800-4FED AID.)

Student Support Services

Description: Provides low-income, first generation college students, as well as disabled students, with support services to increase retention and graduation rates. Projects provide services such as counseling, tutoring, and instruction in study skills.
Potential grantees: Higher education institutions or a combination of higher education institutions
Funding: $183,300,000 in Fiscal Year 2000
Average award: $230,000 for 1 year of a four-year grant
Next competition: Fiscal Year 2000 *Contact:* Linda Bird-Johnson at (202) 502-7600 or OPE_TRIO@ed.gov

McNair Postbaccalaureate Achievement

Description: Prepare participants who have high academic potential and come from disadvantaged backgrounds for doctoral studies through involvement in research and other scholarly activities. Grantees provide services such as mentoring, tutoring and counseling; internships; research opportunities; and help obtaining financial aid and graduate school admission.
Potential Grantees: Higher education institutions and combinations of institutions of higher education
Funding: $34,728,000 in Fiscal Year 2000

Average Award: $222,615 for one year of a grant
Next Competition: Fiscal Year 2003 *Contact:* OPE_TRIO@ed.gov or (202) 502-7600

Child Care Access Means Parents in School

Description: Supports the participation of low-income parents in the postsecondary education system by providing campus-based child care services.
Potential Grantees: Higher education institutions
Funding: $5,000,000 in Fiscal Year 2000
Average Award: $56,897 (estimated)
Next Competition: Not yet scheduled *Contact:* Karen W. Johnson at (202) 502-7525 or Karen_Johnson@ed.gov

Native Hawaiian Higher Education Program

Description: Provides direct grants to Native Hawaiian educational organizations or educational entities with experience in developing or operating Native Hawaiian programs or programs of instruction conducted in the Native Hawaiian language, to enable such organizations or entities to provide a program of baccalaureate and postbaccalaureate fellowship assistance to Native Hawaiian students.
Potential Grantees: Native Hawaiian private nonprofit educational organizations and entities with experience in developing or operating Native Hawaiian programs or programs of instruction conducted in the Native Hawaiian language
Funding: $2,700,000 in Fiscal Year 2000
Average Award: $900,000
Next Competition: Fiscal Year 2001 *Contact:* Susanna Easton at (202) 502-7700 or Susanna_Easton@ed.gov

Robert C. Byrd Honors Scholarship

Description: A federally funded, State-administered program to recognize exceptionally able high school seniors who show promise of continued excellence in postsecondary education. The Department award funds to State education agencies, which make scholarship awards to eligible applicants. Students who receive scholarships use the money for college expenses.

Potential Grantees: State education agencies

Funding: $39,858,000 in Fiscal Year 2000

Average Award: $1,500 scholarships

Next Competition: Fiscal Year 2001 *Contact:* Margaret Wheeler at (202) 502-7777 or Margaret_Wheeler@ed.gov

Supporting Graduate Postsecondary Students

OPE's support for students continues through graduate school. Several programs provide funding, directly or through institutions, for graduate fellowships and research and educational experiences abroad.

Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need

Description: Provides fellowships, through academic departments and programs of institutions of higher education, to assist graduate students with excellent records who demonstrate financial need and plan to pursue the highest degree available in their course of study.
Potential Grantees: Academic programs and departments of higher education institutions
Funding: $30,829,500 in Fiscal Year 2000
Average Award: $139,500
Next Competition: Fiscal Year 2001 *Contact:* Cosette L. Ryan at (202) 502-7700 or Cosette_Ryan@ed.gov

Jacob K. Javits Fellowships

Description: Provides financial assistance to students of superior ability, as demonstrated by their achievements and exceptional promise, to undertake study at the doctoral and Master of Fine Arts (MFA) level in selected fields of the arts, humanities, and social sciences.
Potential Grantees: Students in and applicants to qualified graduate programs
Funding: $9,897,673 in Fiscal Year 2000
Average Award: $23,510
Next Competition: Fiscal Year 2001 *Contact:* Cosette Ryan at (202) 502-7700 or Cosette_Ryan@ed.gov

Native Hawaiian Higher Education Program

Description: Provides direct grants to Native Hawaiian educational organizations or educational entities with experience in developing or operating Native Hawaiian programs or programs of instruction conducted in the Native Hawaiian language, to enable such organizations or entities to provide a program of baccalaureate and postbaccalaureate fellowship assistance to Native Hawaiian students.
Potential Grantees: Native Hawaiian private nonprofit educational organizations and entities with experience in developing or operating Native Hawaiian programs or programs of instruction conducted in the Native Hawaiian language
Funding: $2,700,000 in Fiscal Year 2000
Average Award: $900,000
Next Competition: Fiscal Year 2001 *Contact:* Susanna Easton at (202) 502-7700 or Susanna_Easton@ed.gov

Foreign Language and Area Studies Fellowships

Description: Provides academic year and summer fellowships to institutions of higher education to assist graduate students in foreign language and either area or international studies.
Potential Grantees: Higher education institutions
Funding: $15.1 million in Fiscal Year 2000
Average Award: $128,974
Next Competition: Fiscal Year 2003 *Contact:* John Paul at (202) 502-7700 or OPE_NRC-FLAS@ed.gov

Fulbright-Hays Training Grants--Doctoral Dissertation Research Abroad

Description: Provides grants to colleges and universities to fund individual doctoral students to conduct research in other countries, for periods of 6 to 12 months, in modern foreign languages and area studies.
Potential Grantees: U.S. higher education institutions
Funding: $2.1 million in Fiscal Year 2000
Average Award: $69,573
Next Competition: Fiscal Year 2001 *Contact:* Karla Ver Bryck Block at (202) 502-7700 or Karla_VerBryckBlock@ed.gov

Promoting Innovation and Technology in Education

To ensure that America's students are the best-educated in the world, we have to have top-quality, innovative higher education; replicate the educational approaches that work; and take advantage of all the new technologies that can strengthen student learning. Several OPE programs serve these goals.

FIPSE Comprehensive Program

Description: An annual competition for grants to support and disseminate innovative reform projects that promise to be models for solving problems in postsecondary education.
Potential Grantees: A wide range of non-profit providers of educational services
Funding: $30,590,000 in Fiscal Year 2000
Average Award: Approximately $115,000
Next Competition: Fiscal Year 2001 *Contact:* Cassandra Courtney at (202) 502-7500 or Cassandra_Courtney@ed.gov

Learning Anytime Anywhere Program

Description: Provides grants to broaden access to technology-mediated distance education that is not limited by time or place. Grants may be used to develop model programs and software; innovative on-line student support services such as job placement, academic counseling, and library services; competency-based programs, especially those that use self-paced alternatives to traditional semester scheduling; and methods of assessing the quality and success of distance learning programs.
Potential Grantees: Partnerships among institutions of higher education, community organizations, and other public and private institutions, agencies, and organizations
Funding: $15,000,000 in Fiscal Year 2000
Average Award: $1 million over three years
Next Competition: Fiscal Year 2001 *Contact:* Brian Lekander at (202) 502-7500 or Brian_Lekander@ed.gov

Distance Learning Demonstration Program

Description: Supports the use of technology to deliver instruction by issuing waivers of certain Department regulations in order to enhance access to federal student aid for distance education students pursuing college-level academic studies and training.
Potential Grantees: Not a grant program. Postsecondary schools, systems and consortia can apply for selection as demonstration projects.
Funding: N/A. Fifteen programs were selected in Fiscal Year 1999.
Average Award: N/A
Next Competition: Fiscal Year 2001 (tentative) *Contact:* Marianne Phelps at (202) 502-7750 or DistanceDemo@ed.gov

TRIO Dissemination Partnership Program

Description: Allows TRIO grantees with proven and promising programs and practices to expand and leverage the success of the TRIO programs by working with other institutions and community-based organizations that are serving low-income and first-generation college students but do not have TRIO grants.
Potential Grantees: TRIO projects that were funded as of October 7, 1998
Funding: $5,981,000 in Fiscal Year 2000
Average Award: $192,935
Next Competition: Not yet scheduled *Contact:* Linda Bird-Johnosn at (202) 502-7600 or OPE_TRIO@ed.gov

Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers to Use Technology

Description: Helps future teachers become proficient in the use of modern learning technologies. The program addresses looming teacher shortages by developing well-qualified, technology-proficient teachers who are prepared to teach in 21st century schools, particularly schools in low-income communities or rural areas.

Potential Grantees: Consortia composed of higher education institutions, state agencies, school districts, nonprofit organizations, and other interested organizations
Funding: $75 million in Fiscal Year 2000
Average Award: $400,000
Next Competition: *Fiscal Year 2001* Contact: *Tom Carroll at (202) 502-7788 or Teacher_Technology@ed.gov*

Strengthening International Education

To prepare students to compete in today's international economy, American postsecondary institutions need the resources to give students language skills and understanding of the many nations that constitute our competitors and trading partners. Several Office of Postsecondary Education programs work to meet this need.

National Resource Centers

Description: Provides grants to establish, strengthen, and operate language and area/international studies centers that will be national resources for teaching any modern foreign language; for instruction in fields needed to provide full understanding of areas, regions, or countries; for research and training in international studies; for language aspects of professional and other fields of study; and for instruction and research on issues in world affairs.
Potential Grantees: Higher education institutions, individually and in consortia
Funding: $21,340,000 in Fiscal Year 2000
Average Award: $188,850
Next Competition: Fiscal Year 2003 *Contact:* John Paul at (202) 502-7629 or OPE_NRC-FLAS@ed.gov

Undergraduate International Studies and Foreign Language Program
Description: Provides funds to plan, develop, and carry out programs to strengthen and improve undergraduate instruction in international studies and foreign languages.
Potential Grantees: Institutions of higher education, combinations of such institutions, and partnerships between nonprofit educational organizations and institutions of higher education
Funding: $4.3 million in Fiscal Year 2000
Average Award: $71,775
Next Competition: Fiscal Year 2001 *Contact:* Christine Corey at (202) 502-7629 or Christine_Corey@ed.gov

International Research and Studies
Description: Supports surveys, studies, and development of instructional materials to improve and strengthen instruction in modern foreign languages, area studies, and other international fields.
Potential Grantees: Higher education institutions
Funding: $3,975,000 in Fiscal Year 2000
Average Award: $113,571
Next Competition: Fiscal Year 2001 *Contact:* José L. Martínez at (202) 502-7635 or Jose_Martinez@ed.gov

Business and International Education

Description: Provides funds for higher education institutions that enter into agreements with trade associations and/or businesses to improve the academic teaching of the business curriculum and to conduct outreach activities that expand the capacity of the business community to engage in international economic activities.
Potential Grantees: Higher education institutions
Funding: $4,168,516 in Fiscal Year 2000
Average Award: $77,195

Next Competition: Fiscal Year 2001 *Contact:* Tanyelle Richardson at (202) 502-7626 or Tanyelle_Richardson@ed.gov

Centers for International Business Education
Description: Provides funding to schools of business for curriculum development, research, and training on issues of importance to U.S. trade and competitiveness.
Potential Grantees: Higher education institutions
Funding: $8.1 million in Fiscal Year 2000
Average Award: $289,286
Next Competition: not yet scheduled *Contact:* Susanna Easton at (202) 502-7700 or Susanna_Easton@ed.gov

Language Resource Centers
Description: Provides grants for establishing, strengthening, and operating centers that serve as resources for improving the nation's capacity for teaching and learning foreign languages through teacher training, research, materials development, and dissemination projects.
Potential Grantees: Higher education institutions, individually or in combination
Funding: $2, 984,000 in Fiscal Year 2000
Average Award: $331,556
Next Competition: Fiscal Year 2002 *Contact:* José L. Martínez at (202) 502-7700 or Jose_Martinez@ed.gov

American Overseas Research Centers
Description: provides grants to establish or operate overseas research centers that promote postgraduate research, exchanges, and area studies.
Potential Grantees: Consortia of higher education institutions
Funding: $700,000 in Fiscal Year 2000
Average Award: $63,636
Next Competition: Fiscal Year 2003 *Contact:* Cheryl Gibbs at (202) 502-7700 or cheryl_gibbs@ed.gov

Institute for International Public Policy
Description: Provides a single grant to assist a consortium of colleges and universities to establish an institute designed to increase the representation of minorities in international service, including private international voluntary organizations and the U.S. Foreign Service.
Potential Grantees: Consortia of higher education institutions
Funding: $1,022,000 in Fiscal Year 2000 for one grant
Average Award: $1,022,000
Next Competition: Not yet scheduled *Contact:* Tanyelle Richardson at (202) 502-7700 or Tanyelle_Richardson@ed.gov

Technological Innovation and Cooperation for Foreign Information Access
Description: Provides grants to develop innovative techniques or programs that address national teaching and research needs in international education and foreign languages by using new electronic technologies to access, collect, organize, preserve and widely disseminate information on world regions and countries other than the U.S.
Potential Grantees: Institutions of higher education, public or nonprofit libraries or combinations of these institutions or libraries
Funding: $1,086,000 in Fiscal Year 2000
Average Award: $135,750
Next Competition: Fiscal Year 2002 *Contact:* Susanna Easton at (202) 502-7700 or Susanna_Easton@ed.gov

Fulbright-Hays Training Grants – Group Projects Abroad
Description: Provides grants to support overseas projects in training, research, and curriculum development in modern foreign languages and area studies by teachers, students, and faculty engaged in a common

endeavor. Projects may include short-term seminars, curriculum development, group research or study, or advanced intensive language programs.
Potential Grantees: Higher education institutions, state education departments and private nonprofit educational organizations
Funding: $2,361,010 in Fiscal Year 2000
Average Award: $63,811
Next Competition: Fiscal Year 2001 *Contact:* Lungching Chiao at (202) 502-7700 or Lungching_Chiao@ed.gov

FIPSE Program for North American Mobility in Higher Education
Description: A program jointly administered with the Mexican and Canadian governments to foster student exchange within the context of multilateral curricular development. Students benefit from having an added "North American" curriculum and cultural dimension to their studies through combination of trilateral curricular innovation and study abroad.
Potential Grantees: Consortia of higher education institutions
Funding: $250,000 in Fiscal Year 2000
Average Award: $50,000 for first year awards; $200,000 for four-year duration of grants
Next Competition: Fiscal Year 2001 *Contact:* Michael Nugent at (202) 502-7500 or Mike_Nugent@ed.gov

FIPSE European Community/U.S. Joint Consortia for Cooperation in Higher Education and Vocational Education

Description: Provides grants to add a new European Community/United States dimension to student-centered cooperation and to bring balanced benefits to both the European Community and the United States.
Potential Grantees: Consortia including higher education institutions and other relevant organizations
Funding: $600,000 in Fiscal Year 2000
Average Award: $60,000 for first year awards
Next Competition: Fiscal Year 2001 *Contact:* Frank Frankfort at (202) 502-7500 or Frank_Frankfort@ed.gov

Improving Access through Institutional Development and Support

To ensure that every American has access to quality higher education, OPE works to build capacity at the institutions that serve our country's most underserved groups. The federal Institutional Development programs provide funds to help higher education institutions that serve a large proportion of disadvantaged students improve their academic programs and administrative capabilities. One of OPE's new initiatives is a demonstration program that promotes access to quality postsecondary education for students with disabilities.

Strengthening Institutions

Description: Helps eligible higher education institutions expand their capacity to serve low-income students. An institution's grant activities may include improving and strengthening its academic quality, management, and fiscal stability.
Potential Grantees: Colleges and universities that serve a substantial proportion of students receiving federal financial aid. Specific sums are available for American Indian Tribally Controlled Colleges and Universities ($6 million in Fiscal Year 1999) and for Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian Serving Institutions ($4.4 million in Fiscal Year 2000).
Funding: Approximately $60,250,000 million in Fiscal Year 2000
Average Award: $320,479
Next Competition: Fiscal Year 2001 *Contact:* Darlene Collins at (202) 502-7777 or Darlene_Collins@ed.gov

Strengthening HBCUs

Description: Provides financial assistance to Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) for establishing or strengthening their physical plant, management capabilities, academic resources, and endowment building capacity. Activities may include student services, educational equipment acquisition, facility construction, and faculty/staff development.
Potential Grantees: Historically Black Colleges and Universities as designated by law.
Funding: $148,750,000 in Fiscal Year 2000 distributed by formula.
Average Award: $1,502,525
Next Competition: Not a competitive program. Contact: Kenneth Waters at (202) 502-7777 or Ken_Waters@ed.gov

Developing Hispanic Serving Institutions

Description: Helps eligible institutions of higher education expand their capacity to serve Hispanic and low-income students. Grant activities include faculty development; management improvements; and developing and improving student services.
Potential Grantees: Colleges and universities that serve a substantial proportion of Hispanic students with low incomes.
Funding: $42,250,000 in Fiscal Year 2000
Average Award: $367,391
Next Competition: Fiscal Year 2000 *Contact:* Jessie DeAro at (202) 502-7562 or Jessie_DeAro@ed.gov

Strengthening Historically Black Graduate Institutions

Description: Awards grants to Historically Black Graduate Institutions (HBGIs). Grant activities may include improving and strengthening academic quality, institutional management, access, and fiscal stability.
Potential Grantees: Historically Black Graduate Institutions as designated by law.
Funding: $31,000,000 in Fiscal Year 2000 distributed by formula.
Average Award: Awards range from $1 million to $ 6.7 million
Next Competition: Not a competitive program. *Contact:* Kenneth Waters at (202) 502-7777 or Ken_Waters@ed.gov

Minority Science and Engineering Improvement

Description: Assists predominantly minority institutions in effecting long-range improvement in science education programs, and increasing the flow of underrepresented ethnic minorities, particularly minority women, into science and engineering careers.

Potential Grantees: Colleges and universities with minority enrollment that exceeds 50% of its total enrollment; professional scientific societies; nonprofit science organizations; and non-minority colleges and universities that provide needed services to a group of eligible minority institutions.

Funding: $7,500,000 in Fiscal Year 2000

Average Award: $84,270

Next Competition: Fiscal Year 2000 *Contact:* Deborah Newkirk at (202) 502-7777 or Deborah_Newkirk@ed.gov

Appendix C

[1] Budget of the United States Government, Fiscal Year 2001. Washington, D.C. U.S. Government Printing Office: 2000.
[2] U.S. Department of Education. TRIO program data, fiscal years 1993 and 2000.
[3] The College Board. *Trends in Student Aid*. New York: 1999.
[4] See endnote 2.
[5] U.S. Department of Education. Pell Grant program data, fiscal years 1993 and 2000.
[6] U.S. Department of Education. Higher Education account program data, fiscal years 1990 and 2000.
[7] U.S. Department of Education. National Center for Education Statistics, *The Condition of Education 2000*, NCES 2000-062, Washington DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2000.
[8] U.S. Department of Education. "A Back to School Special Report. Growing Pains: The Challenge of Overcrowded Schools Is Here to Stay." August 21, 2000.
[9] U.S. Department of Education. National Center for Education Statistics. *Descriptive Summary of 1995–96 Beginning Postsecondary Students: Three Years Late*r, NCES 2000–154, by Lutz Berkner, Laura Horn, and Michael Clune. Project Officer: C. Dennis Carroll. Washington, DC: 2000.
[10] U.S. Department of Education. National Center for Education Statistics. *Stopouts or Stayouts? Undergraduates Who Leave College in Their First Year*, NCES 1999-087, by Laura Horn. Project Officer: Dennis Carroll. Washington DC: 1998.
[11] Kominski, Robert and Andrea Adams, *Educational Attainment in the United States: March 1993 and 1992*, U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, P20-476, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC, 1994.
[12] See endnote 8.
[13] See endnote 8.
[14] U.S. Department of Education. National Center for Education Statistics, *Digest of Education Statistics, 1999*, NCES 2000-031, by Thomas D. Snyder. Production Manager, Charlene M. Hoffman. Washington DC: 2000.
[15] *Sacremento Bee*, September 29, 1999.
[16] U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. *Distance Education at Postsecondary Education Institutions: 1997-98.* NCES 2000-013, by Laurie Lewis, Kyle Snow, Elizabeth Farris, Douglas Levin. Bernie Greene, project officer. Washington, DC: 1999.
[17] Institute of International Education. *Open Doors Report on International Educational Exchange: 1998-99.* New York: 1999.
[18] See endnote 9.
[19] Note that this is properly the "Act of July 7, 1862," though it is commonly referenced as the "First Morrill Act."
[20] U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, "Projected Postsecondary Outcomes of 1992 High School Graduates," (Working Paper), Washington, DC: 1999.
[21] U.S. Department of Education. National Center for Education Statistics, *Access to Postsecondary Education for the 1992 High Schools Graduates*, NCES 98-105, by Lutz Berkner and Lisa Chavez. Project Officer: C. Dennis Carroll. Washington DC: 1997.
[22] U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, "Beginning Postsecondary Students (BPS)." Unpublished tabulations.
[23] U.S. Department of Education. National Center for Education Statistics, *Digest of Education Statistics, 1999*, NCES 2000-031, by Thomas D. Snyder. Production Manager, Charlene M. Hoffman. Washington DC: 2000.
[24] See endnote 22.
[25] See endnote 23.
[26] See endnote 23.
[27] U.S. Department of Education. National Center for Education Statistics. *Students With Disabilities in Postsecondary Eduction: A Profile of Preparation, Participation, and Outcomes*, NCES 1999–187, by Laura Horn and Jennifer Berktold. Project Officer: Larry Bobbitt. Washington DC: 1999.
[28] Ibid.
[29] See endnote 1.
[30] See endnote 20.

[31] See endnote 11.
[32] U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, *The Condition of Education 1999*, NCES 1999-022, Washington DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1999.
[33] The College Board. *Trends in College Pricing*. New York: 1999.
[34] U.S. Department of Education. "National Postsecondary Student Aid Study, 1995-96." Unpublished tabulations.
[35] U.S. Department of Education. National Center for Education Statistics, *Digest of Education Statistics, 1999*, NCES 2000-031, by Thomas D. Snyder. Production Manager, Charlene M. Hoffman. Washington DC: 2000.
[36] See endnote 33.
[37] U.S. Department of Education. National Center for Education Statistics. *Debt Burden Four Years AfterCollege*, NCES 2000–188, by Susan P. Choy. Project Officer: C. Dennis Carroll. Washington, DC: 2000.
[38] U.S. Department of Education, Press Release: "National Student Loan Default Rate Lowest Ever." October 2, 2000.
[39] U.S. Department of Education. National Center for Education Statistics. *Student Financing of Undergraduate Education: 1995– 96*, NCES 98-076, by Lutz Berkner. Project Officer: Andrew Malizio. Washington DC: 1998.
[40] See endnote 38.
[41] The National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. *What Matters Most: Teaching for America's Future*. New York: 1996.
[42] National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education. Washington, D.C. 1999.
[43] Farkas, Steve and Jean Johnson with Ann Duffett. *Different Drummers: How Teachers of Teachers View Public Education*. New York: Public Agenda. 1997.
[44] U.S. Department of Education. National Center for Education Statistics, *Schools and Staffing Survey, 1993-94*.
[45] See endnote 41.
[46] U.S. Department of Education. National Center for Education Statistics, *Teacher Quality: A Report on the Preparation and Qualifications of Public School Teacher*s, NCES 1999-080, by Laurie Lewis, Basmat Parsad, Nancy Carey, Nicole Bartfai, Elizabeth Farris, and Becky Smerdon. Bernie Greene, project officer. Washington, DC: 1999.
[47] U.S. U.S. Department of Education. National Center for Education Statistics, 1998 Teacher Survey on Professional Development and Training. Fast Response Survey System, 1999. Unpublished tabulations.
[48] See endnote 46.
[49] Haselkorn, David and Elizabeth Fideler. Learning the Ropes: Urban Teacher Induction Programs and Practices in the United States, Belmont, MA: Recruiting New Teachers, Inc. 1999.
[50] See endnote 44.
[51] The National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. *What Matters Most: Teaching for America's Future*. New York: 1996.
[52] Ibid.
[53] Budget of the United States Government, Fiscal Year 2000. Washington, D.C. U.S. Government Printing Office: 1999.
[54] U.S. Department of Education. Fiscal Year 2001 Justifications of Appropriations Estimates to the Congress: Volume I.
[55] Budget of the United States Government, Fiscal Year 2001. Washington, D.C. U.S. Government Printing Office: 2000.
[56] U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. *Distance Education at Postsecondary Education Institutions: 1997-98*. NCES 2000-013, by Laurie Lewis, Kyle Snow, Elizabeth Farris, Douglas Levin. Bernie Greene, project officer. Washington, DC: 1999.
[57] See endnote 17.
[58] U.S. Department of Education. Fiscal Year 2001 Justifications of Appropriations Estimates to the Congress: Volume II.
[59] See endnote 17.
[60] See endnote 17.